FEED THE FUTURE
The U.S. Government's Global Hunger and Food Security Initiative

Feed the Future Indicator Handbook:
Definition Sheets

U.S. Government Working Document

The Feed the Future (FTF) FY 2012 Indicator Handbook is a working document describing the indicators selected for monitoring and evaluation of the President's global hunger and food security initiative, Feed the Future.

Updated April 4, 2012

List of changes to indicators from June and October 2011 Handbooks

Key changes	1. Performance Indicator Reference Sheet (PIRS) for Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index added 2. Significant change to five indicators (institutional capacity building, gross margins, incremental sales, market discount, firm/CSO operating profitably). Please read new PIRS in its entirety. 3. Phases of research and stages of policy indicators each collapsed into a single indicator with phases or stages as disaggregates. 4. Clarified that technologies that continue to be applied should be included in farmers applying technology indicator. 5. Clarified that MSMEs include farmers for two indicators (MSMEs receiving USG assistance to access loans and MSMEs receiving business development services). 6. Irrigation and disaggregation that sums hectares with one or more improved technology added to Type of Technology disaggregate under # hectares under improved technologies indicator. 7. People in civil society disaggregation added to Type of Individual disaggregate under short-term agriculture productivity training indicator 8. Disaggregate added to stakeholders implementing risk-reduction technologies, women's dietary diversity, and children receiving vitamin A indicators 9. Disaggregate dropped from gross margins, farmers applying new technologies, # members of organizations applying technologies, and firm/CSO profitability indicators 10. Gross margins Gendered Household Type disaggregate changed to Sex of Farmer. 11. "Child no Adult" added to Gendered Household Type disaggregation 12. Deleted reference to disaggregate levels. Disaggregate levels no longer required in FTFMS. 13. Clarified that Mission not centrally-funded M&E contractor responsible for collecting agriculture GDP and % budget to agriculture and nutrition indicators. Changed titles and clarified that latter two indicators measure budget allocations, not expenditures 14. For zone of influence population-based indicators, clarified that M&E contactor collects (locally- or centrally-funded), not only centrally-funded M&E contractor, added reference to using FTF M&E Series Volume 8 standard instrument and deleted reference to different mid-term data collection methods. 15. Numbering of several indicators changed due to F streamlining.

Changes by indicator

SPS ind #	Indicator Title	Changes
Goal: Sustainably Reduce Global Poverty and Hunger		
3.1.9-16	Prevalence of underweight children under five years of age	Numbering changed from 3-1 to 3.1.9-16. Clarified that M&E contactor collects (locally- or centrally-funded), not only centrally-funded M&E contractor. Added reference to using FTF M&E Series Volume 8 standard instrument. Deleted reference to different mid-term data collection methods.
4-16	Prevalence of Poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day	Numbering changed from 4-1 to 4-16. "Child no Adults" added to Gendered HH Type disaggregation. Clarified that M&E contactor collects (locally- or centrally-funded), not only centrally-funded M&E contractor. Added requirement to use FTF M&E Series Volume 8 standard instrument. Deleted reference to using PAT to collect data. Deleted reference to different mid-term data collection methods.
First Level Objective 1: Inclusive Agricultural Sector Growth		

4.5-9	Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG targeted beneficiaries	Numbering changed from 4.5-1 to 4.5-9. Indicator name changed from "Per capita income (as proxied by expenditures) of USG targeted beneficiaries" to "Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG targeted beneficiaries." "Child no Adults" added to Gendered HH Type disaggregation. Clarified that M&E contactor collects (locally- or centrally-funded), not only centrally-funded M&E contractor. Added requirement to use FTF M&E Series Volume 8 standard instrument. Deleted reference to using PAT to collect data. Deleted reference to different mid-term data collection methods.
4.5-3	Percent change in agricultural GDP	Clarified that Mission's M&E contractor or implementing partner collects data, not the centrally-funded M&E contractor
4.5-?	Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index	PIRS for new WEAI added to FTF Indicator Handbook
First Level Objective 2: Improved Nutritional Status Especially of Women and Children		
3.1.9-11	Prevalence of stunted children under five years of age	Numbering changed from 3-2 to 3.1.9-11. Clarified that M&E contactor collects (locally- or centrally-funded), not only centrally-funded M&E contractor. Added reference to using FTF M&E Series Volume 8 standard instrument. Deleted reference to different mid-term data collection methods.
3.1.9-12	Prevalence of wasted children under five years of age	Numbering changed from 3-3 to 3.1.9-162. Clarified that M&E contactor collects (locally- or centrally-funded), not only centrally-funded M&E contractor. Added reference to using FTF M&E Series Volume 8 standard instrument. Deleted reference to different mid-term data collection methods.
3.1.9-13	Prevalence of underweight women	Numbering changed from 3-4 to 3.1.9-13. Clarified that M&E contactor collects (locally- or centrally-funded), not only centrally-funded M&E contractor. Added reference to using FTF M&E Series Volume 8 standard instrument. Deleted reference to different mid-term data collection methods.
IR 1: Improved Agricultural Productivity		
4.5-4	Gross margin per unit of land, kilogram, or animal of selected product (crops/animals selected varies by country)	Definition and Units clarified, Data Collection Methods and Frequency expanded and modified. **Please read**. Gendered Household Type disaggregate changed to Sex of Farmer. Rain-fed, irrigated disaggregate dropped (commodity disaggregate distinguishes rain-fed and irrigated rice.)
4.5.2-40	Number of hectares of agricultural land (e.g., fields, rangeland, agro-forests)showing improved biophysical conditions as a result of USG assistance	INDICATOR ON HOLD
Sub-Intermediate Result 1.1: Enhanced Human and Institutional Capacity Development for Increased Sustainable Agriculture Sector Productivity		
4.5.1-27 and CBLD-5	Score, in percent, of combined key areas of organization capacity amongst USG direct and indirect local implementing partners	New indicator. **Please read**. Replaced June handbook indicators 4.5.1-7, -3, -8, -5, -6 "Number of institutions/organizations that, as a result of USG assistance, are in one of these five stages of improved institutional capacity" and Oct handbook indicator "Average percent change in score on key areas of organization capacity amongst USAID direct and indirect local implementing partners." Added cross-cutting numbering CBLD-5.
4.5.2-5	Number of farmers and others who have applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance	Clarified that technologies that continue to be applied should be included. Type of person disaggregate dropped. Added "Project or association records, farm records" to Data Collection Methods.

4.5.2-6	Number of individuals who have received USG supported long-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training	None.
4.5.2-7	Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training	People in civil society disaggregation added to Type of Individual disaggregate. Includes NGOs, CBOs, CSOs, research and academic organizations. Instructions on how to avoid double-counting producers and firms added.
4.5.2-11	Number of food security private enterprises (for profit), producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) receiving USG assistance	Indicator name changed slightly - "food security" and "(for profit)" added.
4.5.2-27	Number of members of producer organizations and community based organizations receiving USG assistance	"New, continuing" disaggregate dropped. Type of Organization disaggregates renamed and "other" disaggregate dropped
4.5.2-28	Number of private enterprises (for profit), producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) that applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance	Indicator name changed slightly - "(for profit)" added. Clarified new vs. continuing in Definition.
4.5.2-32	Number of stakeholders using climate information in their decision making as a result of USG assistance	Clarified how to count individuals within an organization in Definition. Indicator classified as outcome, not output.
4.5.2-34	Number of stakeholders implementing risk-reducing practices/actions to improve resilience to climate change as a result of USG assistance	Type of practice and sex disaggregates added.
Sub-Intermediate Result 1.2: Enhanced Technology Development, Dissemination, Management, and Innovation		
4.5.1-21	Number of climate vulnerability assessments conducted as a result of USG assistance	None.
4.5.2-2	Number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance	Added “irrigation” and "total w/one or more improved technology" to Technology Type disaggregate list. Explanation of new “total w/one or more improved technologies” disaggregate added to Definition. Dropped reference to double-counting and biophysical conditions.

4.5.2-39	Number of new technologies or management practices in one of the following phases of development: …in Phase I: under research as a result of USG assistance …in Phase II: under field testing as a result of USG assistance …in Phase III: made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance	Indicator collapses three indicators (4.5.2-8, 4.5.2-9, 4.5.2-10, one per phase of development) into a single indicator with phases of development as disaggregate. Numbering of single indicator changed from 4.5.2-8 to 4.5.2-39.
4.5.2-13	Number of rural households benefiting directly from USG interventions	"Child no Adults" added to Gendered HH Type disaggregation. Simplified Definition and description of new vs. continuing disaggregate.
4.5.2-41	Number of water resources sustainability assessments undertaken	Numbering changed from 4.5.2-43 to 4.5.2-41.
Sub-Intermediate Result 1.3: Improved Agriculture Policy Environment		
4-17	Ease of Doing Business rank	Numbering changed from 4-8 to 4-17. Updated Definition. Unit corrected. Component disaggregates dropped.
4.5.1-24	Numbers of Policies/Regulations/Administrative Procedures in each of the following stages of development as a result of USG assistance in each case: Stage 1: Analyzed Stage 2: Drafted and presented for public/stakeholder consultation Stage 3: Presented for legislation/decree Stage 4: Passed/approved Stage 5: Passed for which implementation has begun	Indicator collapses five indicators (4.5.1-9, 4.5.1-10, 4.5.1-11, 4.5.1-12, 4.5.1-13, one per stage of development) into a single indicator with stage of development as disaggregate, in addition to sector. Clarified explanation of Direction of Change. Numbering of single indicator changed from 4.5.1-9 to 4.5.1-24.
Intermediate Result 2: Expanding Markets and Trade		
4.5.2-23	Value of incremental sales (collected at farm- level) attributed to FTF implementation	Definition, Rationale, Unit and Measurement Notes updated. **Please read.**
4.5.2-35	Percent change in value of intra-regional trade in targeted agricultural commodities	None
4.5.2-36	Value of exports of targeted agricultural commodities as a result of USG assistance	Deleted reference to indicator 4.5.2-17.
Sub-Intermediate Result 2.1: Enhanced Agricultural Trade		
4.5.1-26	Average number of days required to trade goods across borders (average of export/import time)	Numbering changed from 4.5.1-18 to 5.4.1-26. Clarified indicator calculation in Definition, Data Source, and Who Collects Data.
Sub-Intermediate Result 2.2: Property Rights to Land and Other Productive Assets Strengthened		

4.5.1-25	Number of households with formalized land	Numbering changed from 4.5.1-16 to 4.5.1-25. Sex of landholder disaggregates "both" changed to "joint" and "firm-owned" changed to "communal." Indicator classified as outcome, not output.
4.5.1-22	Number of rural hectares mapped and adjudicated	Dropped reference to catch shares and fishing access rights in Definition. Sex of landholder disaggregates "both" changed to "joint" and "firm-owned" changed to "communal."
Sub-Intermediate Result 2.3: Improved Market Efficiency		
4.5-10	Total increase in installed storage capacity (m3)	Numbering changed from 4.5-5 to 4.5-10. Clarified indicator should only include storage increased during reporting year. Added "IP records" to How Collected.
4.5-11	Market discount of targeted agriculture commodities	Numbering changed from 4.5-9 to 4.5-11. Definition, Units, Data Source, and Who Collects changed. **Please read**.
4.5.1-17	Kilometers of roads improved or constructed	Deleted reference to "climate-resistant" in Definition. Clarified direct measurement and added "project records" to How Measured.
Sub-Intermediate Result 2.4: Improved Access to Business Development and Sound and Affordable Financial and Risk Management Services		
4.5.2-29	Value of Agricultural and Rural Loans	Added Sex disaggregate "joint" and clarified use of Sex disaggregate "n/a."
4.5.2-30	Number of MSMEs, including farmers, receiving USG assistance to access loans	Added "including farmers" to title and dropped "bank". Clarified that MSMEs include farmers and how to categorize farmer MSME size, how to disaggregate MSME by sex and use of Sex disaggregate "n/a.". Clarified types of sources of loans
4.5.2-37	Number of MSMEs, including farmers, receiving business development services from USG assisted sources	Added "including farmers" to title. Clarified that MSMEs include farmers and how to categorize farmer MSME size and use of Sex disaggregate "n/a."
Intermediate Result 3: Increased Investments in Agriculture and Nutrition-Related Activities		
4.5.2-12	Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of FTF assistance	None.
4.5.2-38	Value of new private sector investment in the agriculture sector or food chain leveraged by FTF implementation	None.
4.5.2-43	Number of firms (excluding farms) or CSOs engaged in agricultural and food security-related manufacturing and services now operating more profitably (at or above cost) because of USG assistance	Numbering changed from 4.5.2-39 changed to 4.5.2-43. "NGOs" changed to "CSOs" in indicator Title. Refined and clarified Definition. **Please read.** Dropped Level of Profitability disaggregate for firms and Stage of Sustainability disaggregate for CSOs.
Sub-Intermediate Result 3.1: Increased Public Sector Investment		
4.5-12	Percentage of national budget allocated to agriculture	Numbering changed from 4.5-10 to 4.5-12. Title changed and Definition clarified to make it clear that indicator measures budget allocation, not expenditures. Added "numerator" and "denominator" to Unit. Changed Who Collects to "Mission's M&E contractor or implementing partner."
3.1.9.3-1	Percentage of national budget allocated to nutrition	Numbering changed from 3.1-5 to 3.1.9.3-1. Title changed and Definition clarified to make it clear that indicator measures budget allocation, not expenditures. Added "numerator" and "denominator" to Unit. Changed Who Collects to "Mission's M&E contractor or implementing partner."

Intermediate Result 4: Increased Employment Opportunities in Project-level, targeted Value Chains		
4.5-2	Number of jobs attributed to FTF implementation	Clarified that indicators include rural- in additional to agriculture-related enterprises in Definition. Added "firm/farm records" to How Collected.
Intermediate Result 5: Increased Resilience of Vulnerable Communities and Households		
3.1.9.1-3 and 4.7-4	Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger	Numbering changed to 3-5 to 3.1.9.1-3 and 4.7-4. Clarified number and treatment of frequency responses in Definition. "Child no Adults" added to Gendered HH Type disaggregation. Clarified that M&E contactor collects (locally- or centrally-funded), not only centrally-funded M&E contractor. Added reference to using FTF M&E Series Volume 8 standard instrument.
3.3.3-15	Number of USG social assistance beneficiaries participating in productive safety nets	None.
4.5.2-14	Number of vulnerable households benefiting directly from USG assistance	"Child no Adults" added to Gendered HH Type disaggregation.
4.5.2-25	Number of people with a savings account or insurance policy as a result of USG assistance	None.
Intermediate Result 6: Improved Access to Diverse and Quality Foods		
3.1.9.1-1	Prevalence of children 6-23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet	Numbering changed from 3.1.9-2 to 3.1.9.1-1. Clarified that M&E contactor collects (locally- or centrally-funded), not only centrally-funded M&E contractor. Added reference to using FTF M&E Series Volume 8 standard instrument. Deleted reference to different mid-term data collection methods.
3.1.9.1-2	Women's Dietary Diversity: Mean number of food groups consumed by women of reproductive age	Numbering changed from 3.1.9-12 to 3.1.9.1-2. Location (urban, rural) disaggregate added. Clarified that M&E contactor collects (locally- or centrally-funded), not only centrally-funded M&E contractor. Added reference to using FTF M&E Series Volume 8 standard instrument. Deleted reference to different mid-term data collection methods.
Intermediate Result 7: Improved Nutrition-Related Behaviors		
3.1.94 and 3.1.9.1-4	Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding of children under six months of age	Numbering changed to 3.1.9-4 and 3.1.9.1-4 . Clarified that M&E contactor collects (locally- or centrally-funded), not only centrally-funded M&E contractor. Added reference to using FTF M&E Series Volume 8 standard instrument. Deleted reference to different mid-term data collection methods.
Intermediate Result 8: Improved Use of Maternal and Child Health and Nutrition Services		
3.1.9-1	Number of people trained in child health and nutrition through USG-supported health area programs	None.
3.1.9-6	Prevalence of anemia among women of reproductive age	Clarified that M&E contactor collects (locally- or centrally-funded), not only centrally-funded M&E contractor. Added reference to using FTF M&E Series Volume 8 standard instrument. Deleted reference to different mid-term data collection methods.
3.1.9-7	Number of health facilities with established capacity to manage acute under-nutrition	None.

3.1.9-14	Prevalence of anemia among children 6-59 months	Numbering changed from 3.1.9-9 to 3.1.9-14. Clarified that M&E contactor collects (locally- or centrally-funded), not only centrally-funded M&E contractor. Added reference to using FTF M&E Series Volume 8 standard instrument. Deleted reference to different mid-term data collection methods.
3.1.9.2-3	Number of children under five years of age who received vitamin A from USG-supported programs	Numbering changed from 3.1.9-10 to 3.1.9.2-3. Location (urban, rural) disaggregate added.
3.1.9-15	Number of children under five reached by USG-supported nutrition programs	Numbering changed from 3.1.9-11 to 3.1.9-15.

Table of Contents by FTF Results Framework

(R) = Required indicator, (RiA) =Required if Applicable indicator, (S) = Standard indicator (WOG) = Whole of Government Indicator

SPS #	Indicator title	Page #
Goal: Sustainably Reduce Global Poverty and Hunger		
3.1.6-16	Prevalence of underweight children under five years of age (R)	10
4-16	Prevalence of Poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day (R)	18
First Level Objective 1: Inclusive Agricultural Sector Growth		
4.5-9	Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG targeted beneficiaries (R)	25
4.5-3	Percent change in agricultural GDP (R)	23
4.5-?	Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (R)	20
First Level Objective 2: Improved Nutritional Status Especially of Women and Children		
3.1.9-11	Prevalence of stunted children under five years of age (R)	5
3.1.9-12	Prevalence of wasted children under five years of age (R)	6
3.1.9-13	Prevalence of underweight women (R)	7
IR 1: Improved Agricultural Productivity		
4.5-4	Gross margin per unit of land, kilogram, or animal of selected product (crops/animals selected varies by country) (RiA)	24
4.5.2-40	Number of hectares of agricultural land (e.g., fields, rangeland, agro-forests)showing improved biophysical conditions as a result of USG assistance (indicator on hold)	62
Sub-Intermediate Result 1.1: Enhanced Human and Institutional Capacity Development for Increased Sustainable Agriculture Sector Productivity		
4.5.1-27 CBLD-5	Score, in percent, of combined key areas of organization capacity amongst USG direct and indirect local implementing partners (S)	36
4.5.2-5	Number of farmers and others who have applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (RiA) (WOG)	40
4.5.2-6	Number of individuals who have received USG supported long-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training (S)	41
4.5.2-7	Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training (RiA) (WOG)	42
4.5.2-11	Number of food security private enterprises (for profit), producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) receiving USG assistance (RiA) (WOG)	43
4.5.2-27	Number of members of producer organizations and community based organizations receiving USG assistance (S)	49
4.5.2-28	Number of private enterprises, producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) that applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (RiA) (WOG)	50
4.5.2-32	Number of stakeholders using climate information in their decision making as a result of USG assistance (S)	53
4.5.2-34	Number of stakeholders implementing risk-reducing practices/actions to improve resilience to climate change as a result of USG assistance (S)	54
Sub-Intermediate Result 1.2: Enhanced Technology Development, Dissemination, Management, and Innovation		
4.5.1-21	Number of climate vulnerability assessments conducted as a result of USG assistance (S)	30
4.5.2-2	Number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (RiA) (WOG)	38

4.5.2-39	Number of new technologies or management practices in one of the following phases of development: …in Phase I: under research as a result of USG assistance …in Phase II: under field testing as a result of USG assistance …in Phase III: made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance (S)	60
4.5.2-13	Number of rural households benefiting directly from USG interventions (S)	45
4.5.2-41	Number of water resources sustainability assessments undertaken (S)	63
Sub-Intermediate Result 1.3: Improved Agriculture Policy Environment		
4-17	Ease of Doing Business rank (S)	19
4.5.1-24	Numbers of Policies/Regulations/Administrative Procedures in each of the following stages of development as a result of USG assistance in each case: Stage 1: Analyzed Stage 2: Drafted and presented for public/stakeholder consultation Stage 3: Presented for legislation/decree Stage 4: Passed/approved Stage 5: Passed for which implementation has begun (S)	32
Intermediate Result 2: Expanding Markets and Trade		
4.5.2-23	Value of incremental sales (collected at farm-level) attributed to FTF implementation (RiA)	47
4.5.2-35	Percent change in value of intra-regional trade in targeted agricultural commodities (RiA)	55
4.5.2-36	Value of exports of targeted agricultural commodities as a result of USG assistance (S)	56
Sub-Intermediate Result 2.1: Enhanced Agricultural Trade		
4.5.1-26	Average number of days required to trade goods across borders (S)	35
Sub-Intermediate Result 2.2: Property Rights to Land and Other Productive Assets Strengthened		
4.5.1-25	Number of households with formalized land (RiA) (WOG)	34
4.5.1-22	Number of rural hectares mapped and adjudicated (S)	31
Sub-Intermediate Result 2.3: Improved Market Efficiency		
4.5-10	Total increase in installed storage capacity (S)	26
4.5-11	Market discount of targeted agriculture commodities (S)	27
4.5.1-17	Kilometers of roads improved or constructed (RiA) (WOG)	29
Sub-Intermediate Result 2.4: Improved Access to Business Development and Sound and Affordable Financial and Risk Management Services		
4.5.2-29	Value of Agricultural and Rural Loans (RiA) (WOG)	51
4.5.2-30	Number of MSMEs, including farmers, receiving USG assistance to access loans (S)	52
4.5.2-37	Number of MSMEs, including farmers, receiving business development services from USG-assisted sources (S)	57
Intermediate Result 3: Increased Investments in Agriculture and Nutrition-Related Activities		
4.5.2-12	Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of FTF assistance (S)	44
4.5.2-38	Value of new private sector investment in the agriculture sector or food chain leveraged by FTF implementation (RiA)	59
4.5.2-43	Number of firms (excluding farms) or Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) engaged in agricultural and food security-related manufacturing and services now operating more profitably (at or above cost) because of USG assistance (RiA)	64
Sub-Intermediate Result 3.1: Increased Public Sector Investment		
4.5-12	Percentage of national budget allocated to agriculture (RiA)	28
3.1.9.3-1	Percentage of national budget allocated to nutrition (RiA)	16

Intermediate Result 4: Increased Employment Opportunities in Project-level, targeted Value Chains		
4.5-2	Number of jobs attributed to FTF implementation (RiA)	22
Intermediate Result 5: Increased Resilience of Vulnerable Communities and Households		
3.1.9.1-3 4.7-4	Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (RiA)	14
3.3.3-15	Number of USG social assistance beneficiaries participating in productive safety nets (S)	17
4.5.2-14	Number of vulnerable households benefiting directly from USG interventions (S)	46
4.5.2-25	Number of people with a savings account or insurance policy as a result of USG assistance (S)	48
Intermediate Result 6: Improved Access to Diverse and Quality Foods		
3.1.9.1-1	Prevalence of children 6-23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet (RiA)	11
3.1.9.1-2	Women's Dietary Diversity: Mean number of food groups consumed by women of reproductive age (S)	13
Intermediate Result 7: Improved Nutrition-Related Behaviors		
3.1.9-4 3.1.9.1-4	Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding of children under six months of age (RiA)	2
Intermediate Result 8: Improved Use of Maternal and Child Health and Nutrition Services		
3.1.9-1	Number of people trained in child health and nutrition through USG-supported health area programs (S)	1
3.1.9-6	Prevalence of anemia among women of reproductive age (RiA)	3
3.1.9-7	Number of health facilities with established capacity to manage acute under-nutrition (S)	4
3.1.9-14	Prevalence of anemia among children 6-59 months (S)	8
3.1.9.2-3	Number of children under five years of age who received vitamin A from USG-supported programs (S)	15
3.1.9-15	Number of children under five reached by USG-supported nutrition programs (S)	9

Table of Contents by F Standard Program Structure indicator numbering

(R) = Required indicator, (RiA) =Required if Applicable indicator, (S) = Standard indicator (WOG) = Whole of Government Indicator

SPS # Indicator Title	Pg #
3.1.9-1 Number of people trained in child health and nutrition through USG-supported programs (S)	1
3.1.9-4 Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding of children under six months of age (RiA)	2
3.1.9-6 Prevalence of anemia among women of reproductive age (RiA)	3
3.1.9-7 Number of health facilities with established capacity to manage acute undernutrition (S)	4
3.1.9-11 Prevalence of stunted children under five years of age (R)	5
3.1.9-12 Prevalence of wasted children under five years of age (R)	6
3.1.9-13 Prevalence of underweight women (R)	7
3.1.9-14 Prevalence of anemia among children 6-59 months (S)	8
3.1.9-15 Number of children under five reached by USG-supported nutrition programs (S)	9
3.1.9-16 Prevalence of underweight children under five years of age (R)	10
3.1.9.1-1 Prevalence of children 6-23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet (RiA)	11
3.1.9.1-2 Women's Dietary Diversity: Mean number of food groups consumed by women of reproductive age (S)	13
3.1.9.1-3 Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (RiA)	14
3.1.9.1-4 Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding of children under six months of age (RiA)	2
3.1.9.2-3 Number of children under five who received Vitamin A from USG-supported programs (S)	15
3.1.9.3-1 Percentage of national budget allocated to nutrition (RiA)	16
3.3.3-15 Number of USG social assistance beneficiaries participating in productive safety nets (S)	17
4-16 Prevalence of Poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day (R)	18
4-17 Ease of Doing Business rank (S)	19
4.5-? Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (R)	20
4.5-2 Number of jobs attributed to FTF implementation (RiA)	22
4.5-3 Percent change in agricultural GDP (R)	23
4.5-4 Gross margin per unit of land, kilogram, or animal of selected product (RiA)	24
4.5-9 Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG targeted beneficiaries (R)	25
4.5-10 Total increase in installed storage capacity (m^3) (S)	26
4.5-11 Market discount of targeted agriculture commodities (S)	27
4.5-12 Percentage of national budget allocated to agriculture (RiA)	28
4.5.1-17 Kilometers of roads improved or constructed (RiA) (WOG)	29
4.5.1-21 Number of climate vulnerability assessments conducted as a result of USG assistance (S)	30
4.5.1-22 Number of rural hectares mapped and adjudicated (S)	31
4.5.1-24 Numbers of Policies/Regulations/Administrative Procedures in each of the following stages of development as a result of USG assistance in each case: Stage 1: Analyzed; Stage 2: Drafted and presented for public/stakeholder consultation; Stage 3: Presented for legislation/decree; Stage 4: Passed/approved; Stage 5: Passed for which implementation has begun (S)	32
4.5.1-25 Number of households with formalized land (RiA) (WOG)	34
4.5.1-26 Average number of days required to trade goods across borders (average of export/import time) (S)	35
4.5.1-27 Score, in percent, of combined key areas of organization capacity amongst USG direct and indirect local implementing partners (S)	36
4.5.2-2 Number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (RiA) (WOG)	38
4.5.2-5 Number of farmers and others who have applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (RiA) (WOG)	40
4.5.2-6 Number of individuals who have received USG supported long-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training (S)	41
4.5.2-7 Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training (RiA) (WOG)	42
4.5.2-11 Number of food security private enterprises (for profit), producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) receiving USG assistance (RiA) (WOG)	43
4.5.2-12 Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of FTF assistance (S)	44
4.5.2-13 Number of rural households benefiting directly from USG interventions (S)	45
4.5.2-14 Number of vulnerable households benefiting directly from USG assistance (S)	46
4.5.2-23 Value of incremental sales (collected at farm-level) attributed to FTF implementation (RiA)	47
4.5.2-25 Number of people with a savings account or insurance policy as a result of USG assistance (S)	48
4.5.2-27 Number of members of producer organizations and community based organizations receiving USG assistance (S)	49

4.5.2-28 Number of private enterprises, producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations and community-based organizations (CBOs) that applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (RiA) (WOG)	50
4.5.2-29 Value of Agricultural and Rural Loans (RiA) (WOG)	51
4.5.2-30 Number of MSMEs, including farmers, receiving USG assistance to access loans (S)	52
4.5.2-32 Number of stakeholders using climate information in their decision making as a result of USG assistance (S)	53
4.5.2-34 Number of stakeholders implementing risk-reducing practices/actions to improve resilience to climate change as a result of USG assistance (S)	54
4.5.2-35 Percent change in value of intra-regional trade in targeted agricultural commodities (RiA)	55
4.5.2-36 Value of exports of targeted agricultural commodities as a result of USG assistance (S)	56
4.5.2-37 Number of MSMEs, including farmers, receiving business development services from USG assisted sources (S)	57
4.5.2-38 Value of new private sector investment in the agriculture sector or food chain leveraged by FTF implementation (RiA)	59
4.5.2-39 Number of technologies or management practices in one of the following phases of development: Phase I: under research as a result of USG assistance; Phase II: under field testing as a result of USG assistance; Phase III: made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance (S)	60
4.5.2-40 Number of hectares of agricultural land (fields, rangeland, agro-forests) showing improved biophysical conditions as a result of USG assistance (RiA) [INDICATOR ON HOLD]	62
4.5.2-41 Number of water resources sustainability assessments undertaken (S)	63
4.5.2-43 Number of firms (excluding farms) or Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) engaged in agricultural and food security-related manufacturing and services now operating more profitably (at or above cost) because of USG assistance (RiA)	64
4.7-4 Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (RiA)	14
CBLD-5 Score, in percent, of combined key areas of organization capacity amongst USG direct and indirect local implementing partners (S)	36

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 3.1.9: Nutrition
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 8: Improved utilization of maternal and child health and nutrition services

INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-1 Number of people trained in child health and nutrition through USG-supported programs (S)

DEFINITION:
Number of people (health professionals, primary health care workers, community health workers, volunteers, non-health personnel) trained in child health care and child nutrition through USG-supported programs during the reporting year.

RATIONALE:
Development of human capacity through training is a major component of USG-supported health and nutrition programs in this element.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number ** For this indicator, please simply count the training attendance numbers without distinguishing whether the same person received multiple trainings. In that case, that person would be counted several times, which is acceptable for this indicator.**	Sex: Male, Female
TYPE: Output	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partners; service statistics from USAID projects

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project-level; only those trained through USG activities
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Through activity records/program data
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annual

PS LOCATION: Program Element 3.1.9: Nutrition
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 7: Improved nutrition-related behaviors

INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-4 and **3.1.9.1-4 Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding of children under six months of age (RiA)**

DEFINITION:
This indicator measures the percent of children 0-5 months of age who were exclusively breastfed during the day preceding the survey. Exclusive breastfeeding means that the infant received breast milk (including milk expressed or from a wet nurse) and may have received ORS, vitamins, minerals and/or medicines, but did not receive any other food or liquid.

The numerator for this indicator is the total number of children 0-5 months in the sample exclusively breastfed on the day and night preceding the survey. The denominator is the total number of children 0-5 months in the sample with exclusive breastfeeding data.

RATIONALE:
Exclusive breastfeeding for 6 months provides children with significant health and nutrition benefits, including protection from gastrointestinal infections and reduced risk of mortality, due to infectious disease.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Please enter these two data points: 1. percent of children 0-5 months of age in sample who are exclusively breast fed 2. total population of children 0-5 months of age in zone of influence	Sex: Male, Female
TYPE: OUTPUT/OUTCOME Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Population-based survey and official DHS data (see notes below).

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL of COLLECTION:** ***For FTF:*** We will monitor this indicator in our targeted sub-national regions/districts (i.e. "zones of influence," or the geographic region(s)/districts targeted by the USG intervention) to measure results attributable to USG assistance. Where possible, we will also monitor this indicator at the national level to keep a contextual "pulse" on the country situation. National level data should be obtained from the DHS, usually conducted every five years.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR:** An M&E contractor will collect this data in FTF Zone of Influence and will also enter official DHS data into the FTF Monitoring System, when available.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED:** The M&E contractor will conduct population-based surveys in the targeted Zone of Influence to collect this data, using the official DHS method of collection and the FTF M&E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future Zone of Influence Indicators. This contractor will use DHS data, collected every five years, to look at national-level data. Information on the frequency of DHS by country can be obtained at: http://www.measuredhs.com/aboutsurveys/search/metadata.cfm?surv_id=228&ctry_id=33&SrvyTp=country
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION:** Data should be collected in the Zone of Influence for baseline, mid-term (ideally), and final reporting.

For detailed guidance on how to collect and tabulate this indicator, refer to the WHO document: Indicators for assessing infant and young child feeding practices, Part 2, Measurement, available at http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2010/9789241599290_eng.pdf

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 3.1.9: Nutrition
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 8: Improved utilization of maternal and child health and nutrition services

INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-6 Prevalence of anemia among women of reproductive age (RiA)

DEFINITION:
Anemia is measured by hemoglobin concentration in the blood and, for this indicator, is collected among women of reproductive age (15-49 years). Non pregnant women (NPW) with a hemoglobin concentration less than 12g/dl and Pregnant women (PW) with a hemoglobin concentration less than 11g/dl are classified as anemic. Although different levels of severity of anemia can be measured, this indicator measures the prevalence of all anemia, i.e. mild, moderate and severe anemia combined

The numerator for this indicator is the total number of anemic women 15-49 years in the sample. The denominator is the total number of women 15-49 years in the sample with hemoglobin data.

RATIONALE:
This indicator emphasizes the importance of women's micronutrient nutrition both pre-pregnancy and during pregnancy for the growth and development of the child in-utero and for a safe delivery and positive birth outcome. Maternal anemia during pregnancy is associated with increased risk of hemorrhage, sepsis, maternal mortality, perinatal mortality, and low birth weight. Maternal micronutrient nutrition (including adequate iron stores) is also necessary to support optimal maternal care for the child, including nutrient content of breastmilk fed to the child, during infancy and early childhood. This IR emphasizes use of nutrition services with the assumption that if people use the health and nutrition services, anemia in women of reproductive age will drop.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Please enter these two data points: 1. percent of women 15-49 years in sample with anemia 2. total population of women of reproductive age (15-49 years) in zone of influence	Physiological status: Pregnant, Non-pregnant
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Lower is better

DATA SOURCE:
Population-based survey and official DHS data (see notes below)

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- **LEVEL of COLLECTION:** ***For FTF:*** We will monitor this indicator in our targeted sub-national regions/districts (i.e. "zones of influence," or the geographic region(s)/districts targeted by the USG intervention) to measure results attributable to USG assistance. Where possible, we will also monitor this indicator at the national level to keep a contextual "pulse" on the country situation. National level data should be obtained from the DHS, usually conducted every five years.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR:** An M&E contractor will collect this data in FTF Zone of Influence and will also enter country-level DHS data into the FTF Monitoring System, when available.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED:** The M&E contractor will conduct population-based surveys in the targeted Zone of Influence to collect this data, using the official DHS method of collection and the FTF M&E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future Zone of Influence Indicators. This contractor will use DHS data, collected every five years, to look at national-level data. Information on the frequency of DHS by country can be obtained at: http://www.measuredhs.com/aboutsurveys/search/metadata.cfm?surv_id=228&ctry_id=33&SrvyTp=country
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION:** Data should be collected in the Zone of Influence for baseline and final reporting.

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 3.1.9: Nutrition
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 8: Improved utilization of maternal and child health and nutrition services

INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-7 Number of health facilities with established capacity to manage acute undernutrition (S)

DEFINITION:
A health facility may include government health clinics, private clinics as well as clinics run by community-based organizations or local NGOs. Many health facilities are set up by International NGOs (INGOs), who may also provide staff training. As long as a local entity is actually running the facility, it can be counted here, even if a non-local entity was influential in setting up, funding, or training the staff. An "established capacity to manage acute under nutrition" indicates the organization has a program with established procedures, methods and appropriate materials (resources, trained staff, etc.) to address acute under nutrition. An example of this could be a facility that meets the criteria on the National Protocol in the Community Management of Acute Malnutrition (CMAM) program. This indicator is asking how many health facilities have this type of management capacity.

NOTE: This indicator should include all currently capable health facilities, and not only those who achieved the capability during this fiscal year. The intention is to reflect the current coverage of capable health facilities during each given fiscal year

RATIONALE:
A key objective of FTF is the "Improved nutritional status, especially of women and children." Assistance to poor via health facilities that treat under-nutrition is a key component to achieving this objective.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number	Location: Urban, rural
TYPE:	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:*
Outcome	Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project-level; only those health facilities supported by USG intervention
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Program data, assessment of health facilities involved in project
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annual

SPS LOCATION: Objective 3: Investing in People
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – Key Objective: Improved Nutritional Status Especially of Women and Children

INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-11 Prevalence of stunted children under five years of age (R)

DEFINITION:

Stunting is a height-for-age measurement that is a reflection of chronic undernutrition. This indicator measures the percent of children 0-59 months who are stunted, as defined by a height for age Z score < -2. Although different levels of severity of stunting can be measured, this indicator measures the prevalence of all stunting, i.e. both moderate and severe stunting combined While stunting is difficult to measure in children 0-6 months and most stunting occurs in the -9-23 month range (1,000 days), this indicator data will still be reported for all children under 5 to capture the impact of interventions over time and to align with DHS data.

The numerator for this indicator is the total number of children 0-59 months in the sample with a height for age Z score < -2. The denominator is the total number of children 0-59 months in the sample with height for age Z score data.

RATIONALE:
Stunted, wasted, and underweight children under five years of age are the three major nutritional indicators. Stunting is an indicator of linear growth retardation, most often due to prolonged exposure to an inadequate diet and poor health. Reducing the prevalence of stunting among children, particularly 0-23 months, is important because linear growth deficits accrued early in life are associated with cognitive impairments, poor educational performance, and decreased work productivity among adults. Better nutrition leads to increased cognitive and physical abilities, thus improving individual productivity in general, including improved agricultural productivity.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Please enter these two data points: 1. percent of children 0-59 month of age in the sample that is stunted 2. total population of children 0-59 month of age in zone of influence	Sex: Male, Female
TYPE: Impact	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Lower is better

DATA SOURCE:
population-based survey and official DHS data (see notes below)

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL of COLLECTION:** ***For FTF:*** We will monitor this indicator in our targeted sub-national regions/districts (i.e. "zones of influence," or the geographic region(s)/districts targeted by the USG intervention) to measure results attributable to USG assistance. Where possible, we will also monitor this indicator at the national level to keep a contextual "pulse" on the country situation. National level data should be obtained from the DHS, usually conducted every five years.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR:** An M&E contractor will collect this data in FTF Zone of Influence and will also enter country-level DHS data into the FTF Monitoring System, when available.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED:** The M&E contractor will conduct population-based surveys in the targeted Zone of Influence to collect this data, using the official DHS method of collection and the FTF M&E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future Zone of Influence Indicators. This contractor will use DHS data, collected every five years, to look at national-level data. Information on the frequency of DHS by country can be obtained at: http://www.measuredhs.com/aboutsurveys/search/metadata.cfm?surv_id=228&ctry_id=33&SrvyTp=country
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION:** Data should be collected in the Zone of Influence for baseline, mid-term (ideally), and final reporting.

SPS LOCATION: Objective 3: Investing in People
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – Key Objective: Improved Nutritional Status especially of Women and Children

INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-12 Prevalence of wasted children under five years of age (R)

DEFINITION:
This indicator measures the percent of children 0-59 months who are acutely malnourished, as defined by a weight for height Z score < -2. Although different levels of severity of wasting can be measured, this indicator measures the prevalence of all wasting, i.e. both moderate and severe wasting combined.

The numerator for the indicator is the total number of children 0-59 months in the sample with a weight for height Z score < -2. The denominator is the total number of children 0-59 months in the sample with weight for height Z score data.

RATIONALE:
Stunted, wasted, and underweight children under five years of age are the three major nutritional indicators. Wasting is an indicator of acute malnutrition. Children who are wasted are too thin for their height, and have a much greater risk of dying than children who are not wasted.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Please enter these two data points: 1. percent of children 0-59 months of age in the sample that is wasted 2. total population of children 0-59 months of age in zone of influence	Sex: Male, Female
TYPE: Impact	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Lower is better

DATA SOURCE:
Population-based survey and official DHS data (see notes below).

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL of COLLECTION:** ***For FTF:*** We will monitor this indicator in our targeted sub-national region/districts (i.e. "zones of influence," or the geographic region(s)/districts targeted by the USG intervention) to measure results attributable to USG assistance. Where possible, we will also monitor this indicator at the national level to keep a contextual "pulse" on the country situation. National level data should be obtained from the DHS, usually conducted every five years.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR:** An M&E contractor will collect this data in FTF Zone of Influence and will also enter country-level DHS data into the FTF Monitoring System, when available.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED:** The M&E contractor will conduct population-based surveys in the targeted Zone of Influence to collect this data, using the official DHS method of collection and the FTF M&E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future Zone of Influence Indicators. This contractor will use DHS data, collected every five years, to look at national-level data. Information on the frequency of DHS by country can be obtained at: http://www.measuredhs.com/aboutsurveys/search/metadata.cfm?surv_id=228&ctry_id=33&SrvyTp=country
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION:** Data should be collected in the Zone of Influence for baseline, mid-term (ideally), and final reporting.

SPS LOCATION: Objective 3: Investing in People
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – Key Objective: Improved Nutritional Status Especially of Women and Children

INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-13 Prevalence of underweight women (R)

DEFINITION:
This indicator measures the percent of non-pregnant women of reproductive age (15-49 years) who are underweight, as defined by a body mass index (BMI) < 18.5. To calculate an individual's BMI, weight and height data are needed: BMI = weight (in kg) ÷ height (in meters) squared.

The numerator for this indicator is the number of non pregnant women 15-49 years in the sample with a BMI < 18.5. The denominator for this indicator is the number of non pregnant women 15-49 years in the sample with BMI data.

RATIONALE:
This indicator provides information about the extent to which women's diets meet their caloric requirements. Adequate energy in the diet is necessary to support the continuing growth of adolescent girls and women's ability to provide optimal care for their children and participate fully in income generation activities. Undernutrition among women of reproductive age is associated with increased morbidity, poor food security, and can result in adverse birth outcomes in future pregnancies. Improvements in women's nutritional status are expected to improve women's work productivity, which may also have benefits for agricultural production, linking the two strategic objectives of FTF.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Please enter these two data points: 1. percent of women of reproductive age in the sample that is underweight 2. total population of women of reproductive age in zone of influence	None
TYPE: Impact	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Lower is better

DATA SOURCE:
Population-based survey and official DHS data (see notes below).

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL of COLLECTION:** ***For FTF:*** We will monitor this indicator in our targeted sub-national regions/districts (i.e. "zones of influence," or the geographic region(s)/districts targeted by the USG intervention) to measure results attributable to USG assistance. Where possible, we will also monitor this indicator at the national level to keep a contextual "pulse" on the country situation. National level data should be obtained from the DHS, usually conducted every five years.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR:** An M&E contractor will collect this data in FTF Zone of Influence and will also enter country-level DHS data into the FTF Monitoring System, when available.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED:** The M&E contractor will conduct population-based surveys in the targeted Zone of Influence to collect this data, using the official DHS method of collection and the FTF M&E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future Zone of Influence Indicators. This contractor will use DHS data, collected every five years, to look at national-level data. Information on the frequency of DHS by country can be obtained at: http://www.measuredhs.com/aboutsurveys/search/metadata.cfm?surv_id=228&ctry_id=33&SrvyTp=country
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION:** Data should be collected in the Zone of Influence for baseline, mid-term (ideally), and final reporting.

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 3.1.9: Nutrition
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 8: Improved utilization of maternal and child health and nutrition services

INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-14 Prevalence of anemia among children 6-59 months (S)

DEFINITION:
Anemia is measured by hemoglobin concentration in the blood and, for this indicator, is collected among children 6-59 months. Children with a hemoglobin concentration less than 11g/dl are classified as anemic. Although different levels of severity of anemia can be measured, this indicator measures the prevalence of all anemia, i.e. mild, moderate and severe anemia combined

The numerator for this indicator is the total number of anemic children 6-59 months. The denominator is the total number of children 6-59 months in the sample with hemoglobin data.

Note that a similar indicator (#3.1.3-42) exists in the List of Standard Indicators from F, but is used to measure anemia as associated with malaria. Although it may be difficult to determine whether a child's anemia is being caused by malaria or nutritional factors, report results under this indicator when measuring as part of a nutrition-related intervention and report results under #3.1.3-42 when measuring as part of a malaria-related intervention.

RATIONALE:
This indicator highlights the importance of micronutrient nutrition (iron status, in particular) for child health and development. Child anemia is associated with adverse consequences for child growth and development, including increased morbidity and impaired cognitive development.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Please enter these two data points: 1. percent of children 6-59 months in sample with anemia 2. total population of children 6-59 months in zone of influence	Sex: Male, Female
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Lower is better

DATA SOURCE:
Population-based survey and official DHS data (see notes below)

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL of COLLECTION:** ***For FTF:*** We will monitor this indicator in our targeted sub-national regions/districts (i.e. "zones of influence," or the geographic region(s)/districts targeted by the USG intervention) to measure results attributable to USG assistance. Where possible, we will also monitor this indicator at the national level to keep a contextual "pulse" on the country situation. National level data should be obtained from the DHS, usually conducted every five years.

- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR:** An M&E contractor will collect this data in FTF Zone of Influence and will also enter official DHS data into the FTF Monitoring System, when available.

- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED:** The M&E contractor will conduct population-based surveys in the targeted Zone of Influence to collect this data, using the official DHS method of collection and the FTF M&E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future Zone of Influence Indicators. This contractor will use DHS data, collected every five years, to look at national-level data. Information on the frequency of DHS by country can be obtained at: http://www.measuredhs.com/aboutsurveys/search/metadata.cfm?surv_id=228&ctry_id=33&SrvyTp=country

- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION:** Data should be collected in the Zone of Influence for baseline and final reporting.

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 3.1.9: Nutrition
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 8: Improved utilization of maternal and child health and nutrition services

INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-15 Number of children under five reached by USG-supported nutrition programs (S)

DEFINITION:
Number of children under five years of age reached during the reporting year by programs with nutrition objectives, which can include behavior change communication activities, home or community gardens, micronutrient fortification or supplementation, anemia reduction packages, growth monitoring and promotion and management of acute malnutrition.

RATIONALE:
Good coverage of nutrition programs is essential to prevent and treat malnutrition and improve child survival.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number	Sex: Male, Female
TYPE:	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:*
Output	Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project-level; only those children reached by USG intervention
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Activity records/program data
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annual

SPS LOCATION: Objective 3: Investing in People
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – Goal: Sustainably Reduce Global Poverty and Hunger

INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-16 Prevalence of underweight children under five years of age (R)

DEFINITION:
Underweight is a weight-for-age measurement. Underweight is a reflection of acute and/or chronic undernutrition. This indicator measures the percent of children 0-59 months who are underweight, as defined by a weight for age Z score < -2. Although different levels of severity of underweight can be measured, this indicator measures the prevalence of all underweight, i.e. both moderate and severe underweight combined.

The numerator for this indicator is the total number of children 0-59 months in the sample with a weight for age Z score < -2. The denominator is the total number of children 0-59 months in the sample with weight for age Z score data.

RATIONALE:
Reducing the prevalence of underweight children under five is the goal of the Feed the Future Initiative. The prevalence of underweight children is also an indicator to monitor the Millennium Development Goal 1.8 "Halving the number of people who are hungry." Monitoring the prevalence of underweight children 0-59 months therefore allows USAID and its partners to show the contribution of FTF programs to the Millennium Development Goal.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Please enter these two data points: 1. percent of children 0-59 months of age in the sample that is underweight 2. total population of children 0-59 months of age in zone of influence	Sex: Male, Female
TYPE: Impact	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Lower is better

DATA SOURCE:
Population-based survey and official DHS data (see notes below)

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL of COLLECTION:** ***For FTF:*** We will monitor this indicator in our targeted sub-national regions/districts (i.e. "zones of influence," or the geographic region(s)/districts targeted by the USG intervention) to measure results attributable to USG assistance. Where possible, we will also monitor this indicator at the national level to keep a contextual "pulse" on the country situation. National level data should be obtained from the DHS, usually conducted every five years.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR:** An M&E contractor will collect this data in FTF Zone of Influence and will also enter country-level DHS data into the FTF Monitoring System, when available.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED:** The M&E contractor will conduct population-based surveys in the targeted Zone of Influence to collect this data, using the official DHS method of collection and the FTF M&E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future Zone of Influence Indicators. This contractor will use DHS data, collected every five years, to look at national-level data. Information on the frequency of DHS by country can be obtained at: http://www.measuredhs.com/aboutsurveys/search/metadata.cfm?surv_id=228&ctry_id=33&SrvyTp=country
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION:** Data should be collected in the Zone of Influence for baseline, mid-term (ideally), and final reporting.

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 3.1.9: Nutrition
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 6: Improved Access to Diverse and Quality Foods

INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9.1-1 Prevalence of children 6-23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet (RiA)

DEFINITION:
This indicator measures the proportion of children 6-23 months of age who receive a minimum acceptable diet (MAD), apart from breast milk. The "minimum acceptable diet" indicator measures both the minimum feeding frequency and minimum dietary diversity, as appropriate for various age groups. If a child meets the minimum feeding frequency and minimum dietary diversity for their age group and breastfeeding status, then they are considered to receive a minimum acceptable diet.

Tabulation of the indicator requires that data on breastfeeding, dietary diversity, number of semi-solid/solid feeds and number of milk feeds be collected for children 6-23 months the day preceding the survey. The indicator is calculated from the following two fractions:

1. Breastfed children 6-23 months of age in the sample who had at least the minimum dietary diversity and the minimum meal frequency during the previous day

---

Breastfed children 6-23 months of age in the sample with MAD component data

and

2. Non-breastfed children 6-23 months of age who received at least 2 milk feedings and had at least the minimum dietary diversity not including milk feeds and the minimum meal frequency during the previous day

---

Non-breastfed children 6-23 months of age in the sample with MAD component data

Minimum dietary diversity for breastfed children 6-23 months is defined as four or more food groups out of the following 7 food groups (refer to the WHO IYCF operational guidance document cited below):

1. Grains, roots and tubers
2. Legumes and nuts
3. Dairy products (milk, yogurt, cheese)
4. Flesh foods (meat, fish, poultry and liver/organ meats)
5. Eggs
6. Vitamin-A rich fruits and vegetables
7. Other fruits and vegetables

Minimum meal frequency for breastfed children is defined as two or more feedings of solid, semi-solid, or soft food for children 6-8 months and three or more feedings of solid, semi-solid or soft food for children 9-23 months.

For the MAD indicator, minimum dietary diversity for non breastfed children is defined as four or more food groups out of the following six food groups:

1. Grains, roots and tubers
2. Legumes and nuts
3. Flesh foods (meat, fish, poultry and liver/organ meats)
4. Eggs
5. Vitamin-A rich fruits and vegetables
6. Other fruits and vegetables

Minimum meal frequency for non breastfed children is defined as four or more feedings of solid, semi-solid, soft food, or milk feeds for children 6-23 months. For non-breastfed children to receive a minimum adequate diet, at least two of these feedings must be milk feeds.

RATIONALE: Appropriate feeding of children 6-23 months is multidimensional. The minimum acceptable diet indicator combines standards of dietary diversity (a proxy for nutrient density) and feeding frequency (a proxy for energy density) by breastfeeding status; and thus provides a useful way to track progress at simultaneously improving the key quality and quantity dimensions of children's diets.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Please enter these two data points: 1. percent of children 6-23 months in sample receiving a minimum acceptable diet 2. total population of children 6-23 months in	Sex: Male, Female

zone of influence	
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better
DATA SOURCE: Population-based survey and official DHS data (see notes below)	

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL of COLLECTION:** ***For FTF:*** We will monitor this indicator in our targeted sub-national regions/districts (i.e. "zones of influence," or the geographic region(s)/districts targeted by the USG intervention) to measure results attributable to USG assistance. Where possible, we will also monitor this indicator at the national level to keep a contextual "pulse" on the country situation. National level data should be obtained from the DHS, usually conducted every five years.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR:** An M&E contractor will collect this data in FTF Zone of Influence and will also enter country-level DHS data into the FTF Monitoring System, when available.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED:** The M&E contractor will conduct population-based surveys in the targeted Zone of Influence to collect this data, using the official DHS method of collection and the FTF M&E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future Zone of Influence Indicators. This contractor will use DHS data, collected every five years, to look at national-level data. Information on the frequency of DHS by country can be obtained at: http://www.measuredhs.com/aboutsurveys/search/metadata.cfm?surv_id=228&ctry_id=33&SrvyTp=country
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION:** Data should be collected in the Zone of Influence for baseline, mid-term (ideally), and final reporting.

For detailed guidance on how to collect and tabulate this indicator, refer to the WHO document: Indicators for assessing infant and young child feeding practices, Part 2, Measurement, available at http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2010/9789241599290_eng.pdf

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 3.1.9: Nutrition
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 6: Improved access to diverse and quality foods

INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9.1-2 Women's Dietary Diversity: Mean number of food groups consumed by women of reproductive age (S)

DEFINITION:
This validated indicator aims to measure the micronutrient adequacy of the diet and reports the mean number of food groups consumed in the previous day by women of reproductive age (15-49 years). To calculate this indicator, nine food groups are used:

1. Grains, roots and tubers; 2. Legumes and nuts; 3. Dairy products (milk, yogurt, cheese); 4. Organ meat; 5. Eggs; 6. Flesh foods and other misc. small animal protein; 7. Vitamin A dark green leafy vegetables; 8. Other Vitamin A rich vegetables and fruits; 9. Other fruits and vegetables

The *Mean number of food groups consumed by women of reproductive age* indicator is tabulated by averaging the number of food groups consumed (out of the nine food groups above) across all women of reproductive age in the sample with data on dietary diversity.

RATIONALE:
Women of reproductive age are at risk for multiple micronutrient deficiencies, which can jeopardize their health and ability to care for their children and participate in income generating activities. Maternal micronutrient deficiencies during lactation can directly impact child growth and development but the potential consequences of maternal micronutrient deficiencies are especially severe during pregnancy, when there is the greatest opportunity for nutrient deficiencies to cause long term, irreversible development consequences for the child in-utero. Dietary diversity (assessed here as the number of food groups consumed) is a key dimension of a high quality diet with adequate micronutrient content; and thus, important to ensuring the health and nutrition of both women and their children.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number Please enter these two data points: 1. Mean number of food groups consumed by women 15-49 years in the sample 2. Total population of women of reproductive age (15-49 years) in zone of influence	Location: Urban, Rural
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Population-based survey and official DHS data (see notes below)

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
To collect data for this indicator, a more disaggregated set of food groups than the nine food groups above should be used in the questionnaire. The same set of food groups that are used to collect the dietary diversity component of the MAD indicator for children can be used (refer to the WHO Operational Guide for more details, http://www.fanta-2.org/downloads/pdfs/IYCF_Measurement_2010.pdf)

For collection and tabulation of this indicator, foods used in condiment amounts should not be counted as having been consumed.

- **LEVEL of COLLECTION:** ***For FTF:*** We will monitor this indicator in our targeted sub-national regions/districts (i.e. "zones of influence," or the geographic region(s)/districts targeted by the USG intervention) to measure results attributable to USG assistance. Where possible, we will also monitor this indicator at the national level to keep a contextual "pulse" on the country situation. National level data should be obtained from the DHS, usually conducted every five years.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR:** An M&E contractor will collect this data in FTF Zone of Influence and will also enter country-level DHS data into the FTF Monitoring System, when available.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED:** The M&E contractor will conduct population-based surveys in the targeted Zone of Influence to collect this data, using the official DHS method of collection and the FTF M&E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future Zone of Influence Indicators. This contractor will use DHS data, collected every five years, to look at national-level data. Information on the frequency of DHS by country can be obtained at: http://www.measuredhs.com/aboutsurveys/search/metadata.cfm?surv_id=228&ctry_id=33&SrvyTp=country
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION:** Data should be collected in the Zone of Influence for baseline, mid-term (ideally), and final reporting.

SPS LOCATION: Objective 3: Investing in People
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF - IR 5: Increased resilience of vulnerable communities and households

INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9.1-3 and 4.7-4 Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger (RiA)

DEFINITION:
This indicator measures the percent of households experiencing moderate or severe hunger, as indicated by a score of 2 or more on the household hunger scale (HHS). To collect data for this indicator, respondents are asked about the frequency with which three events were experienced by household members in the last four weeks: 1. no food at all in the house; 2. went to bed hungry, 3. went all day and night without eating. For each question, four responses are possible (never, rarely, sometimes or often), which are collapsed into the follow three responses: never (value=0), rarely or sometimes (value=1), often (value=2). Values for the three questions are summed for each household, producing a HHS score ranging from 0 to 6.

The numerator for this indicator is the total number of households in the sample with a score of 2 or more on the HHS. The denominator is the total number of households in the sample with HHS data.

RATIONALE:
Measurement of household hunger provides a tool to monitor global progress of USG supported food security initiatives. A decrease in household hunger is also a reflection of improved household resilience. The indicator has been validated to be meaningful for cross-cultural use using data sets from seven diverse sites.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Please enter these two data points: 1. percent of households in sample with moderate to severe hunger 2. total population of households in zone of influence	Gendered Household type: Adult Female no Adult Male (FNM), Adult Male no Adult Female (MNF), Male and Female Adults (M&F), Child No Adults (CNA)
TYPE: Impact	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Lower is better

DATA SOURCE:
Population-based survey and official DHS data (see notes below).USAID/W will work to get these HHS questions incorporated into the DHS in applicable countries. Then, the DHS will also be able to show this data at the national level.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

This indicator should always be measured at the same time each year, at the most vulnerable part of the year (e.g. right before harvest, during the dry season, etc.) Although this indicator will be collected in the Zone of Influence by an M&E contractor, USAID/W is also working with HQ and Missions to have the HHS added as a module to the DHS, which is usually conducted every 5 years. Missions direct which modules the DHS should add to the default set of survey questions, and all Focus Countries should request that the HHS module be added to any upcoming DHS for collection of the national-level data.

- **LEVEL of COLLECTION:** ***For FTF:*** We will monitor this indicator in our targeted sub-national regions/districts (i.e. "zones of influence," or the geographic region(s)/districts targeted by the USG intervention) to measure results attributable to USG assistance. Where possible, we will also monitor this indicator at the national level to keep a contextual "pulse" on the country situation. National level data should be obtained from the DHS, usually conducted every five years.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR:** An M&E contractor will collect this data in FTF Zone of Influence and will also enter country-level DHS data into the FTF Monitoring System, when available.
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED:** The M&E contractor will conduct population-based surveys in the targeted Zone of Influence to collect this data, using the official DHS method of collection and the FTF M&E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future Zone of Influence Indicators. This contractor will use DHS data, collected every five years, to look at national-level data. Information on the frequency of DHS by country can be obtained at: http://www.measuredhs.com/aboutsurveys/search/metadata.cfm?surv_id=228&ctry_id=33&SrvyTp=country
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION:** Data should be collected in the Zone of Influence for baseline, mid-term (ideally), and final reporting.

For more information on the HHS, including guidance for collection and tabulation of the prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger, refer to the FANTA-2 website: www.fanta-2.org

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 3.1.9: Nutrition
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 8: Improved utilization of maternal and child health and nutrition services

INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9.2-3 Number of children under five who received Vitamin A from USG-supported programs (S)

DEFINITION:
Number of children under five years of age who received Vitamin A from USG-supported programs in the last 6 months from the time this data is collected. In order to reduce Vitamin-A deficiency most effectively, children need two rounds of coverage in one year. In order to not double count children, please only report the number done in the last 6 months.

RATIONALE:
Vitamin A supplementation reduces risk of under-five mortality by about one-fourth among the millions of children deficient in this micronutrient

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number	Location: Urban, Rural Sex: Male, Female
TYPE:	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:*
Output	Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partners, service statistics from USAID projects

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project-level; only those children reached by USG intervention
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Activity records/program data
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annual

SPS LOCATION: Objective 3: Investing in People
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 3: Increased investment in agriculture and nutrition-related activities
Sub IR 3.1: Increased public sector investment

INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9.3-1 Percentage of national budget allocated to nutrition (RiA)

DEFINITION: This indicator provides the amount of funding from the country's national budget directed towards nutrition. This figure will most likely be reflected in line items under the Ministry of Health and/or the Ministry of Agriculture.

RATIONALE:
To measure sustainable public sector investment in nutrition activities, we will monitor trends in the amount and percentage of national budget allocated to nutrition. Public investment in nutrition demonstrates the host government's commitment to improving the nutritional status of its citizens and is a core component of the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) movement.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Please enter these two data points: 1. numerator: amount of national budget in USD allocated to nutrition 2. denominator: total national budget amount in USD ***FTF System Note: An option for "government does not currently have this information separated out" will be available, with the intention of seeing countries move into having nutrition budget information in the future if they do not currently have it.***	None
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Increase is better

DATA SOURCE:
Host government budget sheets.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- LEVEL of COLLECTION: National, contextual
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Mission's M&E contractor or implementing partner
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Host government budget publications or treasury records
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annual

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 3.3.3: Social Assistance
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 5: Increased resilience of vulnerable communities and households

INDICATOR TITLE: 3.3.3-15 Number of USG social assistance beneficiaries participating in productive safety nets (S)

DEFINITION:
The number of people participating in USG-supported social assistance programming with productive components aimed at increasing community assets, household assets, or strengthening human capital.

Productive safety nets are programs that protect and strengthen food insecure households' physical and human capital by providing regular resource transfers in exchange for time or labor. Generally there are three kinds of activities that can provide the foundation of a "productive safety net" program. These are:

- Activities which strengthen community assets (e.g. public works);
- Activities which strengthen human assets (e.g. literacy training, and HIV, prenatal and well-baby visits); and/or
- Activities which strengthen household assets (e.g. livelihood diversification, agriculture extension, micro savings and credit)

What sets productive safety nets apart from other social assistance programs is that the assistance—a predictable resource transfer—is provided in exchange for labor or to offset the opportunity cost of an investment of time. For this reason they are sometimes referred to as "conditional" safety net programs. Another difference is an expectation that, over time, individuals or households enrolled in a productive safety net program will "graduate" from that program.

RATIONALE:
Provides information on USG assistance aimed at increasing self-sufficiency in vulnerable populations.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number	Type of Asset strengthened: community assets, human assets/capital, and household assets, New vs. Continuing: --New = this is the first year the beneficiary participated in a productive safety net --Continuing = this beneficiary may have participated in the year prior, but participated again this fiscal year Sex: Male, Female
TYPE: Output	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project-level; only those targeted by USG interventions
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Activity records
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annual

SPS LOCATION: Objective 4: Economic Growth
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF Goal: Sustainably Reduce Global Poverty and Hunger

INDICATOR TITLE: 4-16 Prevalence of Poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.25/day* (R)

**The MDGs define this level as those living in "extreme poverty." Although we do not use the word "extreme" in this title, we are referring to the same measure used by the UN for the MDGs.*

DEFINITION:

This indicator measures Millennium Development Goal Target 1a. Halving extreme poverty refers to the period 1990 to 2015. The applicable poverty line has been updated to $1.25 dollars per person per day, converted into local currency at 2005 "Purchasing Power Parity" (PPP) exchange rates. The use of PPP exchange rates ensures that the poverty line applied in each country has the same real value. Measurement is based on the value of average daily consumption expenditure per person, where food and other items that a household consumes out of its own production are counted as if the household purchased those items at market prices. For example, all members of a household of four people are counted as poor if its average daily consumption expenditures are less than $5 per day at 2005 PPP after adjusting for local inflation since 2005. The poverty rate is estimated by dividing the measured number of poor people in a sample of households by the total population in the households in the sample.

Data for this indicator must be collected using the Consumption Expenditure methodology of the Living Standards Measurement Survey (LSMS). Missions are encouraged to use the LSMS Integrated Survey in Agriculture Consumption Expenditure module, which has been incorporated in the FTF M&E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future Zone of Influence Indicators. FTF will collect consumption-expenditure data in order to calculate prevalence of poverty for this indicator, as well as per capita expenditures to be used as a proxy for income. Expenditures are used instead of income because of the difficulty in accurately measuring income and because expenditure data are less prone to error, easier to recall and are more stable over time than income data.

RATIONALE:

This measures the first goal of the Feed the Future Initiative as well as a Millennium Development Goal. It is the purpose of the FTF Initiative. All objectives, program elements, and projects are designed to reduce poverty.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Percent Please enter these two data points: 1. Percentage of people from sample living on <$1.25/day 2. Total population of people in zone of influence	Gendered Household Type: Adult Female no Adult Male (FNM), Adult Male no Adult Female Adult (MNF), Male and Female Adults (M&F), Child no Adults (CNA)
TYPE: Impact	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Lower is better

DATA SOURCE:

MDG database for national level; Population-based surveys conducted by the M&E contractor in the FTF zone of influence.

MEASUREMENT NOTES

At the national level, this is a contextual indicator that is not USG-attributable, but should still be measured to assess overall food security situation in a country. Because this is a contextual indicator, no targets will need to be set at the national level.

- **LEVEL of COLLECTION:** This indicator should be collected in the FTF Zones of Influence (i.e. the targeted population/sub-national level) through household/population-based surveys, as well as monitored at the national level. This data is already collected by the UN for measuring progress towards the MDG, and is available at the country and regional levels in the MDG database at http://mdgs.un.org/unsd/mdg/Data.aspx
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR:** The UN already collects this data for the MDGs at the country and regional level; however, an M&E contractor will do the collection in the FTF Zone of Influence
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED:** For the national level data, the M&E contractor should be consistent in pulling the country information from the MDG database, knowing the methods used by UN described in this data collection handbook: http://mdgs.un.org/unsd/mdg/Data.aspx. For the Zone of Influence survey, the M&E contractor should conduct a population-based survey using the LSMS methodology and the FTF M&E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future Zone of Influence Indicators, in conjunction with collection of the nutrition indicators (i.e. there should be one survey to collect all the impact-level data for the FTF initiative).
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION:** Data should be collected in the Zone of Influence for baseline, mid-term (ideally), and final reporting.

SPS LOCATION: Objective 4: Economic Growth
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1: Improved Agricultural Productivity / Sub IR 1.3: Improved Agricultural Policy Environment

INDICATOR TITLE: 4-17 Ease of Doing Business rank (S)

DEFINITION:

Every year the World Bank publishes "Doing Business" with data gathered from almost all countries. The topics that make up the index include 9 that have been included consistently since 2010: 1) starting a business, 2) construction permits, 3) registering property, 4) getting credit, 5) protecting investors, 6) paying taxes, 7) trading across borders, 8) enforcing contracts and 9) closing a business/resolving insolvency. Two topics: 1) getting electricity and 2) employing workers, have been included in the aggregate score some but not all years since 2010. Most of the indicators that are used are easily understood like the number of procedures to start a business, the number of days to register property or total taxes as a percent of profit. In addition the Bank periodically publishes more detailed indices for individual countries which provide detail on the difference in different parts of the country. For the purpose of this indicator the overall score is used. The reporting country ought to look at the more detailed Doing Business report to determine which items contributed to the improvement or lack of improvement of the overall score. This can provide a guide to actions that are most likely to improve the business environment

From the WB website: *"The ease of doing business index ranks economies from 1 to 183. For each economy the index is calculated as the ranking on the simple average of its percentile rankings on each of the topics included in the index…The ranking on each topic is the simple average of the percentile rankings on its component indicators. If an economy has no laws or regulations covering a specific area—for example, bankruptcy—it receives a "no practice" mark. Similarly, an economy receives a "no practice" or "not possible" mark if regulation exists but is never used in practice or if a competing regulation prohibits such practice. Either way, a "no practice" mark puts the economy at the bottom of the ranking on the relevant indicator."*

RATIONALE:
Improving the business environment is likely to contribute to improving investment. The World Bank emphasizes that most of the data collected for the DB comes from small and medium businesses which makes it more useful for FTF. The Bank also provides detailed information on how the data is collected as well as where there are weaknesses.
The development hypothesis is that making it easier to do business is likely to lead to more investment and thus jobs. The increase in investment will improve agricultural productivity (the IR) which in turn will contribute to agricultural sector growth (the Key Objective). As most of the poor are involved directly or indirectly in agriculture this improvement will reduce poverty.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Percentile Rank	None
TYPE:	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:*
Outcome	A higher ranking is better

DATA SOURCE:
World Bank *Doing Business*, an annual report available on line: http://www.doingbusiness.org/
Please see the data collection methodology here http://www.doingbusiness.org/methodology/methodology-note#Ease of DB
**Note that Gates Foundation and World Bank are working to develop an "Ease of Doing Agri-business" indicator, but it is not yet available.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
This is a contextual indicator that, although not USG-attributable at the national level, should still be measured to assess this aspect of enabling environment in a country. Because this is a contextual indicator, no targets need to be set.

FTF System note: In order to analyze change, the rank will be entered each year into the FTF database, which will do an automatic calculation of the change in rank from the previous year. The change in rank is also available in the WB report.

- LEVEL of COLLECTION: National level, for monitoring context
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: The data are already collected by the World Bank's annual report. The centrally-funded FTF M&E contractor will pull the *Doing Business* score for each country and populate this in the FTF database/M&E system.
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: The FTF M&E contractor will research this data on http://www.doingbusiness.org/rankingsand enter it into the FTF Monitoring System (FTFMS) for each Focus Country.
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annual

SPS LOCATION: Program Area 4.5:Agriculture
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – First level objective: Inclusive Agriculture Sector Growth

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5-? Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index Score (R)

DEFINITION: The Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI) measures the empowerment, agency, and inclusion of women in the agriculture sector in an effort to identify and address the constraints that hinder women's full engagement in the agriculture sector. The WEAI is composed of two sub-indexes; the Five Domains of Empowerment sub-index (5DE) measures the empowerment of women in five areas; and the Gender Parity sub-Index (GPI) measures the average level of equality in empowerment of men and women within the household. The WEAI is an aggregate index reported at the Zone of Influence level and is based on individual-level data on men and women within the same households and data on women living in households with no adult male.

The 5DE sub-index assesses whether women are empowered across the five domains examined in the WEAI. Each domain is weighted equally, as are each of the indicators within a domain. The five domains, their definitions under the WEAI, the corresponding indicators, and their weights for the 5DE are:

Domain (each weighted 1/5 of 5DE sub-index)	Definition of Domain	Indicators	Weight of indicator in 5DE sub-index
Production	Sole or joint decision-making over food and cash-crop farming, livestock, fisheries as well as autonomy in agricultural production	Input in productive decisions	1/10
		Autonomy in production	1/10
Resources	Ownership, access to, and decision-making power over productive resources such as land, livestock, agricultural equipment, consumer durables, and credit	Ownership of assets	1/15
		Purchase, sale or transfer of assets	1/15
		Access to and decisions on credit	1/15
Income	Sole or joint control over income and expenditures	Control over use of income	1/5
Leadership	Membership in economic or social groups and comfort in speaking in public	Group member	1/10
		Speaking in public	1/10
Time	Allocation of time to productive and domestic tasks and satisfaction with the available time for leisure activities	Workload	1/10
		Leisure	1/10

The 5DE is a measure of empowerment rather than disempowerment. A woman is defined as empowered in the 5DE if she reaches the threshold of empowerment in 80 percent or more of the weighted indicators. For disempowered women, the 5DE also shows the percentage of indicators in which those women meet the threshold of empowerment. The 5DE contributes 90 percent of the weight to the WEAI.

The GPI reflects the percentage of women who are as empowered as the men in their households. It is a relative equality measure that demonstrates the equality in 5DE profiles between the primary adult male and female in each household. In most cases, these are husband and wife, but they can be the primary male and female decision-maker regardless of their relationship to each other. For households that have not achieved gender parity, the GPI shows the gap that needs to be closed for women to reach the same level of empowerment as men. By definition, households without a primary adult male are excluded from this measure, and thus the aggregate WEAI uses the mean GPI value of dual-adult households. The GPI contributes 10 percent of the weight to the WEAI.

The 5DE score ranges from zero to one, where higher values indicate greater empowerment. It is constructed using a robust multidimensional methodology known as the Alkire Foster Method (see http://www.ophi.org.uk/research/multidimensional-poverty/alkire-foster-method/ for information on the method). The score has two components. First, it reflects the percentage of women who are empowered (H_e). Second, it reflects the percentage of domains in which those women who are not yet empowered (H_n) still have adequate achievements (A_a).The 5DE formula is: $5DE = \{H_e + (H_n \times A_a)\}$, where $H_e + H_n = 100\%$ and $0 < A_a < 100\%$.

The GPI also ranges from zero to one, with higher values indicating greater gender parity, and is constructed with two factors. First, it shows the percentage of women whose empowerment scores are lower than the men's in the household (H_{wgP}). Second, the GPI shows the percentage shortfall in empowerment scores (I_{GPI}) for those women who do not have gender parity. The overall formula is the product of these two numbers, following the Foster Greer Thorbecke "poverty gap" measure: $GPI = \{1 - (H_{wgp} \times I_{GPI})\}$.

The WEAI score is computed as a weighted sum of the Zone of Influence-level 5DE and the GPI. Thus, improvements in either the 5DE or GPI will increase the WEAI. The total WEAI score = $0.9\{ H_e + (H_n \times A_a)\} + 0.1\{1 - (H_{GPI} \times I_{GPI})\}$.

RATIONALE:
Feed the Future supports the inclusion of poorer and more economically vulnerable populations in economic growth strategies in the agriculture sector in order to have a transformational effect on regional economies and restructure local production, distribution, and consumption patterns for long-term, sustainable development. Because women play a prominent role in agriculture and due to the persistent economic constraints they face, women's empowerment is a main focus of Feed the Future. Empowering women is particularly important to achieving the Feed the Future objective of inclusive agriculture sector growth. The WEAI was developed to track the change in women's empowerment levels that occurs as a direct or indirect result of interventions under Feed the Future.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number; Please enter these three data points: 1. Score for 5DE sub-index 2. Score for GPI sub-index 3. Total population in Zone of Influence	None
TYPE: Impact	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Population-based surveys conducted by an M&E contractor in the FTF Zone of Influence

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- **LEVEL of COLLECTION:** This indicator should be collected in the FTF Zones of Influence (i.e. the targeted population/sub-national level) through household/population-based surveys.
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR:** An M&E contractor will do the collection in the FTF Zone of Influence
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED:** For the Zone of Influence survey, the M&E contractor should conduct a population-based survey using the WEAI methodology and the FTF M&E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future Zone of Influence Indicators (i.e. there should be one survey to collect all the impact-level data for the FTF initiative).
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION:** Data should be collected in the Zones of Influence for baseline, mid-term, and final reporting.

SPS LOCATION: Program Area 4.5: Agriculture
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR4: Increased employment opportunities in targeted value chains

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5-2 Number of jobs attributed to FTF implementation (RiA)

DEFINITION:
Jobs are all types of employment opportunities **created** during the reporting year in agriculture- or rural-related enterprises (including paid on-farm/fishery employment). Jobs lasting less than one month are not counted in order to emphasize those jobs that provide more stability through length. Jobs should be converted to full-time equivalents. Thus a job that lasts 4 months should be counted as 1/3 FTE. Number of hours worked per day or per week is not restricted as work hours may vary greatly.

"Attributed to FTF implementation" includes farming and non-farm jobs where FTF investments were intentional in assisting in any way to expand (or contract) jobs and where a program objective of the FTF investment was job creation.

RATIONALE:
This is a direct measure of improved livelihoods, as it measures creation of employment and related income. However, FTF is concerned about creation of sustainable employment, not temporary employment (of short duration such as a period of less than one month).

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
FTEs	Location: Urban, rural Duration: New, Continuing: --New= this is the first time the person holds a job created by FTF --Continuing = the person continues to hold a job from a previous fiscal year created by FTF Sex of job-holder: Male, Female (*if one FTE is split by a male and a female, then it would be 0.5 FTE for females and 0.5 FTE for males)*
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partner records

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Only at the project-level, attributed to USG programs
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Through census or sampling of participating firms/farms, depending on size; firm/farm records
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annual

SPS LOCATION: Program Area 4.5: Agriculture
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – Key Objective: Inclusive Agricultural Sector Growth

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5-3 Percent change in agricultural GDP (R)

DEFINITION:
The gross domestic product (GDP) or value of all final goods produced by the agricultural sector within a nation in a given year. The definition of agricultural GDP follows the approach used by the UN statistical office in assisting countries to improve their national accounts. Crop output "is the product of output and the unit price at basic prices"…"less losses and wastes"…plus the net change in inventories. In general "most countries assign output and its associated costs to the time when the crop is harvested." Report year on year change in percent (i.e. annual growth rate).

RATIONALE:
Agricultural GDP is a key measure of overall agricultural performance.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Percent *System Note: First enter baseline Ag GDP (GDP in year before FTF efforts) and then enter Ag GDP each subsequent year in USD. The FTF Monitoring System (FTFMS)* ***will automatically calculate the Percent Change*** *between the previous year and the current year.*	None
TYPE: Impact	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better, in our focus countries

DATA SOURCE:
National accounts collected by the government

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
This is a contextual indicator that, although not USG-attributable at the national level, should still be measured to assess overall food security situation in a country.

- LEVEL of COLLECTION: National level
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Usually this is collected/determined by an entity in the host government (Ministry of Finance, National Stat Office, etc.), and the Mission's M&E contractor or implementing partner will get this information from them.
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Host governments will collect for and calculate their Agricultural GDP. Once the data are entered into the FTF Monitoring System, the system will automatically calculate the "percent change."
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Area 4.5: Agriculture
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1: Improved Agricultural Productivity

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5-4 Gross margin per unit of land, kilogram, or animal of selected product (crops/animals/fisheries selected varies by country) (RiA)

DEFINITION:
The gross margin is the difference between the total value of production of the agricultural product (crop, milk, eggs, fish) and the cost of producing that item, divided by the total number of units in production (hectares of crops, number of animals for milk, eggs; pond area in hectares or crate count for aquaculture). Gross margin per hectare, per animal, or per crate, is a measure of net income for that farm/livestock/fisheries-use activity. Input costs included should be those significant cash costs that can be easily ascertained. Attention should be focused on accounting for cash costs that represent at least 5% of total cash costs. Most likely items are: purchased water, fuel, electricity, seed, feed or fish meal, fertilizer, pesticides, hired labor, hired enforcement, and hired machine/veterinary services. Capital investments and depreciation do not need to be included in cash costs. Unpaid, family labor does not have to be valued and included in costs.

Gross margin is calculated from 5 data points: 1) Hectares planted (for crops); Number of animals (for milk, eggs); or Area (ha) of ponds or Number of crates (for fish), 2) Total Production during reporting period, 3) Value of Sales (USD) during reporting period, 4) Quantity of Sales during reporting period, and 5) Purchased input costs during reporting period (report only those costs that are at least 5% of total cost).

Average price = value of sales divided by quantity of sales
Gross revenue = average price x total production
Net revenue = gross revenue - purchased input cost

Gross margin (per ha, per animal, per pond area, per crate) = net revenue divided by area planted/in production (for crops, ponds), by animals (for milk, eggs); by crates (marine aquaculture)

Reporting includes current-year results for 1) new beneficiaries and 2) beneficiaries who have benefited in previous years from this same USG assistance and continued to benefit during the reporting year (continuing). Reporting all data points (Area/Animal/Crate, Production, Quantity of Sales, Value of Sales, and Purchased Input Cost) is critical to the ability to aggregate results across missions.

RATIONALE:
Improving the gross margin for farm commodities contributes to increasing agricultural GDP, will increase income, and thus directly contribute to the IR of improving production and the goal indicator of reducing poverty. Gross margin of fisheries is an appropriate measure of the productivity of a fishery and the impacts of fisheries management interventions.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
dollars/hectare (crops, aquaculture in ponds); dollars/animal (milk, eggs); or dollars/crate (aquaculture in crates) *Note: See FTF System Note under Measurement Notes below. Convert local currency to USD by using an average of the market foreign exchange rate for the reporting period*	Targeted commodity (type of crop, type of animal, or type of fish – freshwater or marine) Sex of farmer: Male, Female
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
In addition, a sixth data element – water consumption in cubic meters – can be reported in order to calculate water productivity, which is important in irrigated areas. Reporting this sixth data point in addition to the five data points used for Gross Margin allows for the calculation of water productivity.
FTF System Note: Simply enter the 5 data points into the FTF Monitoring System (FTFMS), and it will do the calculation of gross margin automatically. This calculation cannot be done without all 5 data points. Adding the 6th data point will also enable the system to automatically calculate water productivity.

- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project-level, in targeted commodities/fisheries/livestock product
- DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Farmer/fisher/rancher surveys, data collection through producer organizations, standardized group questionnaires, farm records
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually.

SPS LOCATION: Program Area 4.5: Agriculture
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – Key Objective: Inclusive Agricultural Sector Growth

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5-9 Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG targeted beneficiaries (R)

DEFINITION:
This indicator will measure the expenditures of rural households as a proxy for income, based on the assumption that increased expenditures is strongly correlated to increased income. Data for this indicator must be collected using the Consumption Expenditure methodology of the Living Standards Measurement Survey (LSMS). Missions are encouraged to use the LSMS Integrated Survey in Agriculture Consumption Expenditure module, which has been incorporated in the FTF M&E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future Zone of Influence Indicators.. FTF will collect consumption-expenditure data in order to calculate prevalence of poverty as well as per capita expenditures to be used as a proxy for income.

This indicator is a proxy instead of measuring income directly because of the difficulty in accurately measuring income. Expenditures are used instead of income because of the difficulty in accurately measuring income and because expenditure data are less prone to error, easier to recall and are more stable over time than income data.

RATIONALE:
There is a relationship between increased incomes and improved food security, reduced poverty, and improved nutrition. The usefulness of an income proxy methodology derives from the importance of a change in household income and its impact on the overarching FTF goal of reducing poverty and hunger. Thus, measurement of household income (through this proxy) is one logical choice for monitoring the effects of policies and programs oriented towards accomplishing this goal.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
U.S. Dollar Please enter these two data points: 1. Average per capita expenditures (in USD) of sample 2. Total population in zone of influence *Note: To get USD, convert from local currency at the average exchange rate for the reporting period)*	Gendered Household type: Adult Female no Adult Male (FNM), Adult Male no Adult Female (MNF), Male and Female Adults (M&F), Child No Adults (CNA)
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Population-based surveys conducted by M&E contractor in the FTF zone of influence or UN for national level

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
At the national level, this is a contextual indicator that is not USG-attributable, but should still be measured to assess overall food security situation in a country. Because this is a contextual indicator, no targets will need to be set at the national level.

- **LEVEL of COLLECTION:** This indicator should be collected in the FTF Zones of Influence (i.e. the targeted population/sub-national level) through household/population-based surveys, as well as monitored at the national level. This data is already collected by the UN for measuring progress towards the MDG, and is available at the country and regional levels in the MDG database at http://mdgs.un.org/unsd/mdg/Data.aspx
- **WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR:** The UN already collects this data for the MDGs at the country and regional level; however, an M&E contractor will do the collection in the FTF Zone of Influence
- **HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED:** For the national level data, the M&E contractor should be consistent in pulling the country information from the MDG database, knowing the methods used by UN described in this data collection handbook: http://mdgs.un.org/unsd/mdg/Data.aspx. For the Zone of Influence, the M&E contractor should conduct a population-based survey using the LSMS methodology and the FTF M&E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future Zone of Influence Indicators, in conjunction with collection of the nutrition indicators (i.e. there should be one survey to collect all the impact-level data for the FTF initiative)
- **FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION:** Data should be collected in the Zone of Influence for baseline, mid-term (ideally), and final reporting.

SPS LOCATION: Program Area 4.5: Agriculture
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 2: Expanding Markets and Trade / Sub IR 2.3: Improved market efficiency

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5-10 Total increase in installed storage capacity (m^3) (S)

DEFINITION:
This indicator measures total increase during the reporting year in functioning (refurbished and new) cubic meters of storage capacity that have been installed through USG programming and leverage. Installed storage capacity is an aggregate amount that encompasses on-farm and off-farm storage, dry goods and cold chain storage. Both newly installed and refurbished storage should be counted here.

RATIONALE:
The overall goal of the Feed the Future Initiative is to "Sustainably Reduce Global Poverty and Hunger." Post harvest losses of foodstuffs and other agricultural products are typically a significant proportion of overall initial production in developing countries. A reduction in post-harvest losses through greater storage capacity could therefore substantially increase both food and income available to rural households and increase food availability to urban areas as well.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY*:
Total cubic meters	Storage type: Dry, cold
TYPE:	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:*
Output	Increase

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL of COLLECTION: On-farm and off-farm – only direct beneficiaries
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Copies of sales receipts for construction, equipment and installation services; IP records
- FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION: Annual

SPS LOCATION: Program Area 4.5: Agriculture
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 2: Expanding Markets and Trade / Sub IR 2.3: Improved market efficiency

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5-11 Market discount of targeted agriculture commodities (S)

DEFINITION:
The market discount rate (percent) is calculated as {[one (1) minus (average price of a selected commodity/product in country divided by the average price of that commodity/product in the relevant competing market)] times 100} The market discount rate helps monitors if the targeted beneficiaries of a value chain investment are receiving the highest value for their product as compared to a seller in a competitor market receiving an industry or value chain highest price point for the same product.

To ensure comparable prices from each market are used, enter prices consistent with 1) where the two products are in the value chain (e.g. farm-level, aggregation, processing), 2) the state of the products (i.e. the price of the product in each market represents the same state of value addition, e.g. level of processing, type of packaging.), and 3) the costs included in the price (e.g. Free-on-Board, Cargo, Insurance and Freight - - select a price that combines the same costs at both points of sale.)

RATIONALE:
The overall goal of the Feed the Future Initiative is to "Sustainably Reduce Global Poverty and Hunger." The market discount is a qualitative indicator that captures the value of products produced within a value chain and compares that value to an independent reference price. As value chains receive assistance (e.g., better maize drying practices used by farmers) the value of products should improve relative to the value of similar products benchmarked against a reference location(s).

UNIT:
Percent (See System Note)

Average Price (US$/mt) received by USG beneficiaries

Average Price (US$/mt) received in competitor market at a consistent, parallel point in targeted value chain.

FTF System note: Enter the price received by the USG-beneficiary producers and in the competitor market, and the system will calculate the market discount.

DISAGGREGATE BY:
Commodities/products (rice, maize, coffee, mangos, fish, dairy, etc)

TYPE:
Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:
Decrease of the market discount rate, i.e. the farmers are getting the highest price they can

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partners will insert price for targeted commodity/product and appropriate reference market price. System will calculate market discount percentage.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- LEVEL of COLLECTION:CIF, FOB or some similar point in the value chain – targeted beneficiaries only
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners collects price on commodity/product of targeted value chains. The benchmark / reference prices will be determined and collected by Implementing Partner or the Mission's M&E contractor.
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Price information from sales receipts or accounting books, etc.
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Area 4.5: Agriculture
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 3: Increased investment in agriculture and nutrition related activities
Sub IR 3.1: Increased public sector investment

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5-12 Percentage of national budget allocated to agriculture (RiA)

DEFINITION:
The percentage of a country's national budget allocated to agriculture is measured by the amount of money budgeted for the Ministry of Agriculture (and Fisheries, Forestry and similar ministries, if applicable in the country circumstances) divided by the total national budget amount. The indicator measures the amount budgeted (i.e. allocated), not the amount actually expended. While funding to support agriculture may be budgeted in line items other than the line item for the Ministry of Agriculture/Fisheries/Forestry, the amount budgeted for the Ministry of Agriculture/Fisheries/Forestry is used as a proxy for the total budget allocation for agriculture for ease of measurement and comparability across countries.

Note, under CAADP, *"African governments have agreed to increase public investment in agriculture by a minimum of 10 per cent of their national budgets and to raise agricultural productivity by at least 6 per cent."* The indicator CAADP uses to monitor the 10 percent budgetary commitment measures expenditures, not budget allocation. And, the indicator attempts to capture all agriculture-related government expenditures, not just those by the Ministry of Agriculture/Fisheries/Forestry budgets. However, measuring these expenditures is complicated, and Missions would require specialized expertise and expend considerable effort to collect the data. Data for the agriculture-related expenditures indicator are available from a secondary source only for a subset of FTF focus countries, and the considerable lag time before data are available limits the data's usefulness as a measure of government commitment as a result of FTF activities for many of these countries.

RATIONALE:
To measure sustainable public sector investment in agriculture and food security-related activities, we will monitor trends in the percentage of national budget allocated to this type of service delivery. Public investment in agriculture demonstrates the host government's commitment to encouraging economic growth in the sector, and is indicative of the success of FTF's policy engagement.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Percent Please enter these two data points: 1. numerator: amount of national budget in USD allocated to the Ministry of Agriculture 2. denominator: total national budget amount in USD	None
TYPE:	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:*
Outcome	Increase is better

DATA SOURCE:
Host government budget sheets

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- LEVEL of COLLECTION: National, contextual
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: The Mission's M&E contractor or implementing partner
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Host government budget publications or treasury records
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.1: Agricultural Enabling Environment
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 2: Expanding Markets & Trade / Sub IR 2.3: Improved market efficiency

NDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.1-17 Kilometers of roads improved or constructed (RiA) (WOG)

DEFINITION:
A road opens up transport from rural spaces where rural-based production activities such as agriculture are taking place, and connects, either directly or indirectly, with population centers and market activity.

A road "improvement" indicates that the intervention significantly improved the ease of commercial transport along that road, while "constructed" refers to a new road.

In general, a road need not necessarily be paved with cement or asphalt but should significantly facilitate the transport of goods compared to the previous situation without the road or without the road improvement.

Please only count those road improved or constructed during the reporting year.

RATIONALE:
The linkage of rural communities to markets is considered a crucial means of increasing agricultural and other rural-based production as well as the access of rural communities to food at reasonable prices as well as greater off-farm employment opportunities and access to health and nutrition services.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Kilometers	Construction type: Improved, Constructed (new)
TYPE:	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:*
Output	More is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing Partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project-level; only those roads constructed with USG assistance
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Direct measurement, project records
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.1: Agricultural Enabling Environment
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: GCC and FTF – IR 1: Improved Agricultural Productivity / Sub IR 1.2: Enhanced Technology Development, Dissemination, Management and Innovation

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.1-21 Number of climate vulnerability assessments conducted as a result of USG assistance (S)

DEFINITION:
Where existing vulnerability assessments carried out under national or donor processes are not sufficient for developing and implementing a program, a climate vulnerability assessment should be conducted using best practices, at a relevant temporal and spatial scale for the envisioned program, and involving key stakeholders. Best practices include the participatory identification of priority climate-sensitive sectors, livelihoods or systems; identification of priority populations and regions; assessment of anticipated climate and non-climate stresses; estimates of potential impacts; and assessment of exposure, sensitivity, and adaptive capacity of the system to climate stresses.

Only count those assessments conducted during the reporting year.

RATIONALE:
Vulnerability assessments that take climate and non-climate stressors into account form the basis for programming by presenting an integrated problem analysis. A vulnerability assessment should inform, and will help to justify, a program by indicating why certain strategies or activities are necessary to minimize exposure to climate stress, reduce sensitivity, or strengthen adaptive capacity. A range of methods may be used, depending on the decision context, including participatory workshops, community-based PRA-type assessments, economic assessments, risk and vulnerability mapping, etc.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number of assessments	None
TYPE:	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:*
Output	Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project-level
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Implementing Partner records, survey or other applicable method
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.1: Agricultural Enabling Environment
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 2: Expanding Markets & Trade / Sub IR 2.2: Property Rights to Land and Other Productive Assets Strengthened

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.1-22 Number of rural hectares mapped and adjudicated (S)

DEFINITION:
This indicator should be used as an outcome indicator to measure a step in the process towards formalization (see indicator #4.5.1-16), and it tracks the number of **additional** rural hectares that are mapped and adjudicated during the reporting year. "Mapped" indicates that the borders of a land area or water body are clearly indicated as to their physical/geographical location. "Adjudicated" indicates that clear property ownership rights have been established and/or use rights have been defined. This can indicate one owner with "full" use rights to dispose as s/he deems fit including the sale of the land to another owner, or this could be some type of public or common property rights adjudication. This latter situation could involve deciding, for example where certain individuals, certain communities, the public, etc. may or may not engage in certain "use" activities such as to hunt and/or fish and/or engage in agriculture or grazing but does not involve individual ownership. This indicator counts how many additional hectares were mapped and adjudicated in a given year within the project/program area. This contrasts to the other property rights indicator "number of hectares formalized," (#4.5.1-16) which counts the total amount of land that has been assigned formal ownership within the project program area.

RATIONALE:
Clear property rights are a prerequisite for secure investment that encourages long term economic growth in rural areas. Clear property rights also contribute to sustainable use over time by defining what activities may or may not take place on a given area of land and who can engage in those activities.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Hectares	Sex of landholder: -- male --female --joint --communal
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partners, from the relevant host government agency

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project level; only those hectares affected by USG programs
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners, with information from the host governments
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: If land is truly mapped, adjudicated, and otherwise accounted for, the host government or a local entity would keep these records. Implementing partners should obtain data on the applicable hectares from that government or local entity.
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.1: Agricultural Enabling Environment
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1: Improved Agriculture Productivity / Sub IR 1.3: Improved Agricultural Policy Environment

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.1-24 Numbers of Policies/Regulations/Administrative Procedures in each of the following stages of development as a result of USG assistance in each case:

Stage 1: Analyzed
Stage 2: Drafted and presented for public/stakeholder consultation
Stage 3: Presented for legislation/decree
Stage 4: Passed/approved
Stage 5: Passed for which implementation has begun (S)

DEFINITION:

Number of agricultural enabling environment policies / regulations / administrative procedures in the areas of agricultural resource, food, market standards & regulation, public investment, natural resource or water management and climate change adaptation/mitigation as it relates to agriculture that:
Stage 1: …underwent the first stage of the policy reform process i.e. analysis (review of existing policy / regulation / administrative procedure and/or proposal of new policy / regulations / administrative procedures).
Stage 2: …underwent the second stage of the policy reform process. The second stage includes public debate and/or consultation with stakeholders on the proposed new or revised policy / regulation / administrative procedure.
Stage 3: … underwent the third stage of the policy reform process (policies were presented for legislation/decree to improve the policy environment for smallholder-based agriculture.)
Stage 4: …underwent the fourth stage of the policy reform process (official approval (legislation/decree) of new or revised policy / regulation / administrative procedure by relevant authority).
Stage 5: …completed the policy reform process (implementation of new or revised policy / regulation / administrative procedure by relevant authority).
Please count the highest stage completed during the reporting year.

RATIONALE:
The indicator measures the number of policies / regulations / administrative procedures in the various stages of progress towards an enhanced enabling environment for agriculture whose sub-elements are specific policy sectors. This indicator is easily aggregated upward from all operating units.

UNIT: Number ***FTF System Note**:* *Please enter the name of the* policy / regulation / administrative procedure *and then select its sector and stage in order to track movement through the stages. The FTF system will automatically calculate the number of policies at each stage.*	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* Sector: • Inputs (e.g. seed, fertilizer) • Outputs (e.g. rice, maize) • Macroeconomic (e.g. exchange rate) • Agricultural sector-wide (e.g. wage rate for agricultural labor) • Research, extension, information, and other public service • Food security/vulnerable (e.g. safety net) • Climate change adaptation or natural resource management (NRM) (agriculture-related) Stage 1: Analyzed 2: Drafted and presented for public/stakeholder consultation 3: Presented for legislation/decree 4: Passed/approved 5: Passed for which implementation has begun
TYPE: Stages 1 & 2 = Output Stages 3, 4, & 5 = Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Because this indicator tracks individual policies through the disaggregated stages, one should see actuals for each stage change over time in certain ways. One should expect the value of disaggregates measuring the earlier stages to decline and the disaggregates measuring the later stages of progress to increase as the enabling environment is strengthened (i.e., move from analysis to adoption and implementation of reforms)

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing Partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
System Note: In the FTF Monitoring System (FTFMS), the policy title/name should be entered and then associated with one of the five stages listed above, as well as labeled for the sector it addresses. The system ***will automatically aggregate*** *the total number of policies at each stage of development and in each sector.*

Implementing Partners should clearly describe each policy/regulation in the title/description in the system as to avoid double counting by multiple partners operating in a given country. Missions should consider assigning this indicator to the particular partner best positioned to track this indicator.

- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project-level; policies specifically addressed with USG assistance
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Observation and analysis of host government legal status of the various policies being addressed
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.1: Agricultural Enabling Environment
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 2: Expanding Markets & Trade / Sub IR 2.2: Property Rights to Land and Other Productive Assets Strengthened

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.1-25 Number of households with formalized land (RiA) (WOG)

DEFINITION:

"Formalized" here implies that the user of the rural land, farm land, fishery, or water body has some type of formal government administrative recognition of the user's property right of the land/water that significantly increases the tenure security of the resource for the owner. This measures households that, during the reporting year, received formal recognition by government institutions or traditional authorities at national or local levels of ownership and or use rights through certificates, titles, leases, or other recorded documentation. This can include secondary rights. The formalization process varies by project but can include the recordation or registration of a customary or informal right, as well as the regularization or adjudication of rights.

RATIONALE:
Although it is not the only approach, registration of farmland or fishing area increases the security of tenure over the land or fish stocks. This in turn increases the security of durable capital investments in the land that can have significant positive impact on agricultural productivity. Example capital investments include irrigation, cash crop trees, and soil and water conservation (e.g. terraces) or access to fishing grounds. Farmer/Fisher/Rancher households are more likely to invest in productivity enhancing durable capital investments when they have greater security of tenure.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number	Sex of landowner(s) with the formalized rights: --male --female --joint --communal
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* More is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partners records, in conjunction with the National Cadastral Service, or whichever entity records land rights in the government

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
Report on the hectares that became formalized within the targeted geographic scope of the project. The baseline for this indicator would be 0, since you should count only those hectares formalized as a result of USG assistance, not how many are already formalized in the country/region. In many cases a registration document will list multiple users/owners, e.g. both a husband and wife, in which case one should use the disaggregation category of "joint" listed above.

- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project-level; only those households with land formalized as a result of USG assistance
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Implementing Partner records, National Cadastral Service for the records
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.1:Agriculturalal Enabling Environment
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 2: Expanding Markets & Trade / Sub IR 2.1 Enhanced Agricultural Trade

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.1-26 Average number of days required to trade goods across borders (average of export/import time) (S)

DEFINITION:
This Sub IR indicator is from the World Bank's annual *Doing Business* report (see the indicator table in the back of the publication). It is a component of the "trading across borders" section, and is comprised of the components called "time to export (days)" and "time to import (days)". Add the average days to export + the average days to import of the first year before project implementation and divide by two, and that becomes the baseline average number of days to trade. Then in every subsequent year, report the average of the number of days required to trade across borders (i.e. (days to import + days to export) ÷ 2) recorded for that year. The change is calculated by comparing the difference between the baseline (not the previous year) to the current reporting year. The detailed methodology as to how the WB collects this data is reported in their methodology paper.

RATIONALE:
One of the key elements to improving the policy environment is to make it easier to trade across borders. The Bank also includes an overall ranking for trading across borders, the number of documents needed and the cost to export or import (per container). There is usually a good correlation between these, but it is easiest to understand the number of days required for international trade.
The development hypothesis is that speeding up international trade will provide an incentive to improve agricultural output. Because the poor are mainly in farming or agricultural sector activities, simplifying trade is likely to improve the incomes of the poor.

UNIT:
Number (of days)

Calculation: Average of [the # of days to export and the # of days to import]
Baseline (i.e. data from the year before USG intervention) should be entered in order to see how our interventions improve (i.e. reduce) the time it takes to trade across borders

*System note: For the FTF Monitoring System (FTFMS), simply enter the baseline (the first year) and then enter the average # of days required to trade across borders as reported each year in the WB report. The system will automatically calculate the difference from the baseline, or the "**change in days"** for reporting changes in this indicator over time.*

DISAGGREGATE BY:
None

TYPE:
Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:
Lower is better

DATA SOURCE:
World Bank's annual report on *Doing Business (indicator tables in back of report) – available online here: http://www.doingbusiness.org/data/exploretopics/trading-across-borders*

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- LEVEL of COLLECTION: National level, for contextual monitoring
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: The central FTF M&E contractor will obtain this data from the WB website for all countries and enter it into the FTFMS
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: From the 2 components (# of days to export; # of days to import) of the "Trading Across Borders" measurement found in the WB Doing Business report. Select applicable country to see details on each measurement.
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.1: Agricultural Enabling Environment
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1: Improved agricultural productivity
Sub IR 1.1: Enhanced human and institutional capacity development for increased sustainable agriculture sector productivity

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.1-27 and CBLD-5 Score, in percent, of combined key areas of organization capacity amongst USG direct and indirect local implementing partners (S)

DEFINITION:
The reporting of the combined key area score will represent the capacity of local organizations measured across seven key capacity areas using the Organizational Capacity Assessment (OCA) tool. A copy of this tool can be found at the following link J:\Procurement Reform Objective Two\Organizational Capacity Assessment\OCA Overview.docx. The key capacity areas include:

- Governance
- Administration
- Human Resources Management
- Financial Management
- Organizational Management
- Program Management
- Project Performance Management

The result entered for this indicator is calculated using the following numerator and denominator.
Numerator: the total number of points scored.
Denominator: the total number of points possible, which may vary depending on the inclusion of optional OCA sections where relevant. (e.g. the sub-grant management section may or may not be relevant to the organization depending on program)

Operating units should record score data for each organization in their performance management plan files so changes in scores for each organization can be monitored over time (it is not necessary to report each organization's score in the PPR). In addition, each operating unit must include in their performance management plan files: the assessment tool used, a description of the methodology employed for its implementation, and the data source identified as the basis for the rating of each factor.
For purposes of indicator reporting, at the time of the award a "local organization" must,

- Be organized under the laws of the recipient country;
- Have its principal place of business in the recipient country;
- Be majority owned by individuals who are citizens or lawful permanent residents of the recipient country or be managed by a governing body, the majority of whom are citizens or lawful permanent residents of a recipient country; and
- Not be controlled by a foreign entity or by an individual or individuals who are not citizens or permanent residents of the recipient country.

The term "controlled by", means a majority ownership or beneficiary interest as defined above , or the power, either directly or indirectly, whether exercised or exercisable, to control the election, appointment, or tenure of the organization's managers or a majority of the organization's governing body by any means, e.g., ownership, contract, or operation of law.

"Foreign entity" means an organization that fails to meet any part of the "local organization" definition.

Government controlled and government owned organizations in which the recipient government owns a majority interest or in which the majority of a governing body are government employees, are included in the above definition of local organization.

For regional platforms the definition of a local organization can be expanded to include regional organizations that meet the following criteria:

- Be organized under the laws of a country in the region served by the platform;
- Have its principal place of business in the region;
- Be majority owned by individuals who are citizens or lawful permanent residents of the region or be managed by a governing body, the majority of whom are citizens or lawful permanent residents of the region; and
- Not be controlled by a foreign entity or by an individual or individuals who are not citizens or permanent residents of the region.

Both direct and indirect awardees should be included

Regional platforms and bilateral missions also may include obligations or sub-obligations to international organizations composed principally

of countries to which membership is limited to countries within the region, provided the funds are to be implemented directly by or through the regional international organization.

Note: If an operating unit wishes to use an alternative assessment tool, for example one generated through the human and institutional capacity development (HICD) methodology or the IDF tool, it should at a minimum include the factors identified in the OCA.

RATIONALE:
Building the capacity of local institutions is crucial to sustainable development and long-lasting changes in a community. This indicator measures progress in actual local capacity development and will be used by USAID management to report on progress towards achieving USAID Forward local capacity development objectives.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Percent Please enter these two data points: 1. Numerator: the total number of points scored. 2. Denominator: the total number of points possible	None for reporting purposes; however each operating unit should keep separate files to track the percentage change by organization.
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher % is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing Partner

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project-level
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Implementing Partner Records/Survey of institutions if needed
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1: Improved Agricultural Productivity / Sub IR 1.2: Enhanced Technology Development, Dissemination, Management and Innovation

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-2 Number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (RiA) (WOG)

DEFINITION:
This indicator measures the new and continuing area (in hectares) of land under new technology during the current reporting year. Any technology that was first adopted in a previous reporting year and continues to be applied should be marked as "Continuing" (see disaggregation notes below).

Technologies to be counted here are agriculture-related technologies and innovations including those that address climate change adaptation and mitigation (e.g. carbon sequestration, clean energy, and energy efficiency as related to agriculture). Relevant technologies include:

• Mechanical and physical: Irrigation, new land preparation, harvesting, processing and product handling technologies, including biodegradable packaging;

• Biological: New germ plasm (varieties, breeds, etc.) that could be higher-yielding or higher in nutritional content and/or more resilient to climate impacts; affordable food-based nutritional supplementation such as vitamin A-rich sweet potatoes or rice, or high-protein maize, or improved livestock breeds; soil management practices that increase biotic activity and soil organic matter levels; and livestock health services and products such as vaccines;

• Chemical: Fertilizers, insecticides, and pesticides safe storage application and disposal of agricultural chemicals, effluent and wastes, and soil amendments that increase fertilizer-use efficiency (e.g. soil organic matter);

• Management and cultural practices: Information technology, conservation agriculture, improved/sustainable agricultural production and marketing practices, increased use of climate information for planning disaster risk strategies in place, climate change mitigation and energy efficiency, and natural resource management practices that increase productivity (e.g. upstream watershed conservation or bio-diesel fueled farm equipment) and/or resilience to climate change including soil and water conservation and management practices (e.g. erosion control, water harvesting, low or no-till); sustainable fishing practices (.e.g. ecological fishery reserves, improved fishing gear, establishment of fishery management plans); Integrated Pest Management (IPM), and Integrated Soil Fertility Management (ISFM), and Post-Harvest Handling (PHH) related to agriculture should all be included as improved technologies or management practices. Significant improvements to existing technologies should be counted.

If a hectare is under more than one improved technology type (e.g. improved seed (crop genetics) and IPM (pest management), count the hectare under <u>each</u> technology type (i.e. double-count). In addition, count the hectare under the total w/one or more improved technology category. Since it is very common that more than one improved technology is disseminated and applied, this approach allows FTF to accurate count the uptake of different technology types, and to accurately count the total number of hectares under improved technologies.

If a hectare is under more than one improved technology, some of which continue to be applied from the previous year and some of which were newly applied in the reporting year, count the hectare under the relevant technology type as new or continuing, depending on the technology, and under <u>new</u> for the total w/one or more improved technology category (i.e. any new application of an improved technology categorizes a hectare as new, even if other technologies being applied are continuing.)

RATIONALE:
Tracks successful adoption of technologies and management practices in an effort to improve agricultural productivity, agricultural water productivity, sustainability, and resilience to climate impacts.

UNIT: Hectares	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* Technology type: crop genetics (including nutritional enhancement), animal genetics, pest management, disease management, soil-related (fertility and conservation, including tillage), irrigation, water management, post-harvest handling and storage, processing, climate mitigation or adaptation, fishing gear/technique, other, total w/one or more improved technology Duration: --New = this is the first year the hectare came under improved technologies or management practices --Continuing = the hectare being counted continues to be under improved technologies or management practices from the previous year Sex: --male --female --association-applied
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better
DATA SOURCE: Implementing Partners will collect this data through census or survey of program participants, direct observations of land, and report into program documents.	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: ➢ LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project-level; only those hectares affected by USG assistance, and only those brought or continuing under new technologies/management during the current reporting year ➢ WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners ➢ HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Via survey or other applicable method ➢ FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported	

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1: Improved Agricultural Productivity / Sub IR 1.1: Enhanced human and institutional capacity development for increased sustainable agriculture sector productivity

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-5 Number of farmers and others who have applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (RiA) (WOG)

DEFINITION:

This indicator measures the total number of farmers, ranchers and other primary sector producers (food and non-food crops, livestock products, wild fisheries, aquaculture, agro-forestry, and natural resource-based products are included), individual processors (not firms), rural entrepreneurs, managers and traders, natural resource managers, etc. that applied new technologies anywhere within the food and fiber system as a result of USG assistance. This includes innovations in efficiency, value-addition, post-harvest management, sustainable land management, forest and water management, managerial practices, input supply delivery. Any technology that was first applied in a previous year and that continues to be applied should be included as 'continuing'. Technologies to be counted here are agriculture-related technologies and innovations including those that address climate change adaptation and mitigation (including, but not limited to, carbon sequestration, clean energy, and energy efficiency as related to agriculture). Relevant technologies could include:

• Mechanical and physical: New land preparation, harvesting, processing and product handling technologies, including biodegradable packaging

• Biological: New germ plasm (varieties, breeds, etc.) that could be higher-yielding or higher in nutritional content and/or more resilient to climate impacts; affordable food-based nutritional supplementation such as vitamin A-rich sweet potatoes or rice, or high-protein maize, or improved livestock breeds; soil management practices that increase biotic activity and soil organic matter levels; and livestock health services and products such as vaccines;

• Chemical: Fertilizers, insecticides, and pesticides sustainably and environmentally applied, and soil amendments that increase fertilizer-use efficiencies;

• Management and cultural practices: sustainable water management; practices; sustainable land management practices; sustainable fishing practices; information technology, improved/sustainable agricultural production and marketing practices, increased use of climate information for planning disaster risk strategies in place, climate change mitigation and energy efficiency, and natural resource management practices that increase productivity and/or resiliency to climate change. IPM, ISFM, and PHH as related to agriculture should all be included as improved technologies or management practices

Significant improvements to existing technologies should be counted. In the case where, for example, a farmer applies more than one innovation as a result of USG assistance, they are still only counted once. Also, if more than one farmer in a household is applying new technologies, count all the farmers in the household who apply.

This indicator is to count *individuals* who applied new technologies, whereas indicator #4.5.2-28 is to count firms, associations, or other group entities applying new technologies.

RATIONALE:

Technological change and its adoption by different actors in the in the agricultural supply change will be critical to increasing agricultural productivity which is the Intermediate Result which this indicator falls under.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number	Duration --New = This reporting year is the first year the person applied the new technology or management practice --Continuing = The person first applied the new technology or practice in the previous year and continues to apply it Sex: Male, Female

TYPE:	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:*
Outcome	Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:

Implementing Partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project-level; only those individuals targeted by USG programs
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Survey of all targeted individuals, Project or association records, farm records
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1: Improved Agricultural Productivity / Sub IR 1.1: Enhanced human and institutional capacity development for increased sustainable agriculture sector productivity

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-6 Number of individuals who have received USG supported long-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training (S)

DEFINITION:
The number of people who are currently enrolled in or graduated in the current fiscal year from a bachelor's, master's or Ph.D. program or are currently participating in or have completed in the current fiscal year a long term (degree-seeking) advanced training program such as a fellowship program or a post-doctoral studies program. An example is a USDA Borlaug Leadership Enhancement Program..

A person completing one long term training program in the fiscal year and currently participating in another long term training program should be counted only once.

Agricultural productivity includes cultured and natural production (farmers, fishers, ranchers). Include training on climate risk analysis, adaptation, and vulnerability assessments, as it relates to agriculture, but do not include nutrition-related trainings, which should be reported under indicator #3.1.9-1 instead.

This indicator is to count *individuals* receiving training, for which the outcome (individuals applying new practices), should be reported under #4.5.2-5.

RATIONALE:
Measures enhanced human capacity for policy formulation and implementation which is key to transformational development.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number	Sex: Male, Female
TYPE:	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:*
Output	Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing Partners will review program documents to track individuals in long-term training programs.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project-level; individuals targeted by USG program
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Program training records
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1: Improved Agricultural Productivity / Sub IR 1.1: Enhanced human and institutional capacity development for increased sustainable agriculture sector productivity

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-7 Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training (RiA) (WOG)

DEFINITION:
The number of individuals to whom significant knowledge or skills have been imparted through interactions that are intentional, structured, and purposed for imparting knowledge or skills should be counted. This includes farmers, ranchers, fishers, and other primary sector producers who receive training in a variety of best practices in productivity, post-harvest management, linking to markets, etc. It also includes rural entrepreneurs, processors, managers and traders receiving training in application of new technologies, business management, linking to markets, etc, and training to extension specialists, researchers, policymakers and others who are engaged in the food, feed and fiber system and natural resources and water management. In-country and off-shore training are included. Include training on climate risk analysis, adaptation, mitigation, and vulnerability assessments, as it relates to agriculture. Delivery mechanisms can include a variety of extension methods as well as technical assistance activities. An example is a USDA Cochran Fellow.

Training should include food security, water resources management/IWRM, sustainable agriculture, and climate change resilience, but should not include nutrition-related trainings, which should be reported under indicator #3.1.9-1 instead.

This indicator is to count *individuals* receiving training, for which the outcome, i.e. individuals applying new practices, should be reported under #4.5.2-5.

RATIONALE:
Measures enhanced human capacity for increased agriculture productivity, improved food security, policy formulation and/or implementation, which is key to transformational development.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number	Type of individual: -Producers (farmers, fishers, pastoralists, ranchers, etc.) -People in government (e.g. policy makers, extension workers) -People in private sector firms (e.g. processors, service providers, manufacturers) -People in civil society (e.g. NGOs, CBOs, CSOs, research and academic organizations) *Note: While producers are included under MSMEs under indicators 4.5.2-30 and 4.5.2-37, only count them under the Producers and not the Private Sector Firms disaggregate to avoid double-counting. While private sector firms are considered part of civil society more broadly, only count them under the Private Sector Firms and not the Civil Society disaggregate to avoid double-counting.* Sex: Male, Female
TYPE: Output	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project-level; individuals targeted by USG program
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Program training records
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1 Improved Agricultural Productivity / Sub IR 1.1 Enhanced human and institutional capacity development for increased sustainable agriculture sector productivity

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-11 Number of food security private enterprises (for profit), producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) receiving USG assistance (RiA) (WOG)

DEFINITION:
Total number of private enterprises, producers' associations, cooperatives, producers organizations, fishing associations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations and community-based organizations, including those focused on natural resource management, that received USG assistance related to food security during the reporting year. This assistance includes support that aims at organization functions, such as member services, storage, processing and other downstream techniques, and management, marketing and accounting. "Organizations assisted" should only include those organizations for which implementing partners have made a targeted effort to build their capacity or enhance their organizational functions.

In the case of training or assistance to farmer's association or cooperatives, individual farmers are not counted separately, but as one entity.

RATIONALE:
Tracks civil society capacity building that is essential to building agricultural sector productivity.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number	Type of organization (see indicator title for principal types) New/Continuing: --New = the entity is receiving USG assistance for the first time during the reporting year --Continuing = the entity received USG assistance in the previous year and continues to receive it in the reporting year *System note: In the FTF Monitoring System (FTFMS), you will enter the number of each type of organization receiving assistance for your projects, and the system will aggregate the total number for this indicator across all projects.*
TYPE: Output	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project-level
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Project records of training and various USG assistance for these specific types of organizations/associations
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2 AGRICULTURAL SECTOR CAPACITY
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 3: Increased investment in agriculture and nutrition related activities

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-12 Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of FTF assistance (S)

DEFINITION:
Number of public-private partnerships in agriculture or nutrition formed during the reporting year due to FTF intervention (i.e. agricultural or nutrition activity, as described below). Private partnerships can by long or short in duration (length is not a criteria for measurement). Partnerships with multiple partners should only be counted once. A public-private alliance (partnership) is considered formed when there is a clear agreement, usually written, to work together to achieve a common objective. Please count both Global Development Alliance (GDA) partnerships and non-GDA partnerships for this indicator. There must be either a cash or in-kind significant contribution to the effort by both the public and the private entity. USAID must be one of the public partners. USAID is almost always represented in the partnership by its implementing partner. For-profit enterprises and NGOs are considered private. A public entity can be national or sub-national government as well as a donor-funded implementing partner. It could include state enterprises which are non-profit. A private entity can be a private company, a community group, or a state-owned enterprise which seeks to make a profit (even if unsuccessfully).

A mission or a project may form more than one partnership with the same entity, but this is likely to be rare. In counting partnerships we are not counting transactions with a partner entity; we are counting the number of partnerships formed during the reporting year. Public-private partnerships counted should be only those formed during the current reporting year. Any partnership that was formed in a previous year should not be included.

- An agricultural activity is any activity related to the supply of agricultural inputs, production methods, agricultural processing or transportation.
- A nutritional activity includes any activity focused on attempting to improve the nutritional content of agricultural products as provided to consumers, develop improved nutritional products, increase support for nutrition service delivery, etc.

NOTE: Each partnership's formation should only be reported once in order to add the total number of partnerships across years.

RATIONALE:
The assumption of this indicator is that if more partnerships are formed it is likely that there will be more investment in agriculture or nutrition-related activities. This will help achieve IR3 which then contributes to the Key Objective of agriculture sector growth. The improvement in growth will increase the incomes of all, but because the focus of project work is on the vulnerable (women, children and the poor) there will be a reduction in poverty.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number *System note: In the FTFMS, you will enter the name of the partnership, label it for its type, and the system will aggregate the total number for this indicator.*	Partnership focus (refer to the ***primary focus*** of the partnership): -agricultural production -agricultural post-harvest transformation -nutrition -other (do not use this for multi-focus partnerships) -multi-focus (use this if there are several components of the above sectors in the partnership)
TYPE: Output	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partner

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project level; attributable to USG investment
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Observation and records of partnerships created
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1: Improve agricultural productivity / Sub IR 1.2: Enhanced Technology Development, Dissemination, Management and Innovation

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-13 Number of rural households benefiting directly from USG interventions (S)

DEFINITION:
A household is a beneficiary if it contains at least one individual who is a beneficiary. An individual is a beneficiary if s/he is engaged with a project activity or s/he comes into direct contact with the set of interventions (goods or services) provided by the project. Individuals merely contacted or involved in an activity through brief attendance (non-recurring participation) does not count as a beneficiary.

Beneficiaries include the households of people who receive the goods and services of an implementing partner or participate in training, in which "training" is defined as individuals to whom knowledge or skills have been imparted through interactions that are intentional, structured, and purposed for imparting knowledge or skills.

The definition of "rural" should be the definition used by the respective national statistical service. This indicator can include vulnerable households if they are in rural areas.

RATIONALE:
Tracks access and equitable access to services in targeted area.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number	Duration New, Continuing *Rural households reported as benefiting should be those benefiting in the current reporting year. Any households that benefited in a previous year but were not benefiting in the reporting year should not be included. Any household that benefited in the previous year and continues to benefit in the reporting year should be counted under "Continuing." Any household that benefited for the first time during the current reporting year should be counted under "New." No household should be counted under both "Continuing" and "New."* Gendered Household type: Adult Female no Adult Male (FNM), Adult Male no Adult Female (MNF), Male and Female Adults (M&F), Child No Adults (CNA)
TYPE: Output	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project-level; attributable to USG investment
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Project records, surveys, training participant lists, etc.
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 5: Increased resilience of vulnerable communities and households

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-14 Number of vulnerable households benefiting directly from USG assistance (S)

DEFINITION:
A household is a beneficiary if it contains at least one individual who is a beneficiary. An individual is a direct beneficiary if s/he comes into direct contact with the set of interventions (goods or services) provided by the project. The intervention needs to be significant, meaning that if the individual is merely contacted or touched by an activity through brief attendance at a meeting or gathering, s/he should not be counted as beneficiary. Individuals who receive training or benefit from program-supported technical assistance or service provision are considered direct beneficiaries, as are those who receive a ration or another type of good. (An indirect beneficiary, on the other hand, does not necessarily have direct contact with the project but still benefits, such as the population who uses a new road constructed by the project or the individuals who hear a radio message but don't receive any other training or counseling from the project.)

The definition of "vulnerable" will be the definition used by the operating unit in formulating its Results Framework and activities. Possible groups include but are not limited to: HIV/AIDS sufferers and their families and those affected by drought, conflict and low assets (poverty traps), single family head of household, marginalized ethnic groups, those vulnerable to climate change and variability, etc.

Note that households counted under this indicator # 4.5.2-14 could be part of the total in #4.5.2-13, so that one would have "Number of rural households benefiting directly from USG assistance, of which x number are vulnerable."

RATIONALE:
Inclusive agriculture sector growth is dependent on equitable access, and it is a key tenet of FTF to bring in typically marginalized groups.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number	Duration New, Continuing *Vulnerable households reported as benefiting should be those benefiting in the current reporting year. Any households that benefited in a previous year but were not benefiting in the reporting year should not be included. Any household that benefited in the previous year and continues to benefit in the reporting year should be counted under "Continuing." Any household that benefited for the first time during the current reporting year should be counted under "New." No household should be counted under both "Continuing" and "New."* Gendered Household type: Adult Female no Adult Male (FNM), Adult Male no Adult Female (MNF), Male and Female Adults (M&F), Child No Adults (CNA)

TYPE:	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:*
Output	Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project-level; only those affected by USG project reach, strong attribution
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: From definition of "vulnerable" in OU's RF, with info from Project records, surveys, training participant lists, etc.
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Capacity
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR2: Expanding Markets and Trade

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-23 Value of incremental sales (collected at farm-level) attributed to FTF implementation (RiA)

DEFINITION:
This indicator will collect both volume (in metric tons) and value (in US dollars) of purchases from smallholders of targeted commodities for its calculation. The value of incremental sales indicates the value (in USD) of the total amount of agricultural products sold by farm households relative to a base year and can be calculated based on the total value of sales of a product (crop, animal, or fish) during the reporting year minus the total value of sales in the base year. Note that quantity of sales is part of the calculation for gross margin under indicator #4.5—4, and in many cases this will be the same or similar to the value here.

RATIONALE:
Value (in US dollars) of purchases from smallholders of targeted commodities is a measure of the competitiveness of those smallholders. This measurement also helps track access to markets and progress toward commercialization by subsistence and semi-subsistence smallholders. Improving markets will contribute to the Key Objective of increased agricultural productivity and production, which in turn will reduce poverty and thus achieve the goal. Lower level indicators help set the stage to allow markets and trade to expand.

UNIT:
Value of sales (USD)
Volume (tons) must also be collected

Note: Convert local currency to USD at the average market foreign exchange rate for the reporting period

System Note: First enter baseline value of sale (sales in year before FTF efforts) and then enter value of sales in the reporting year in USD. The FTF Monitoring System (FTFMS) ***will automatically calculate the Value of incremental sales*** *between the baseline year and the reporting year.*

DISAGGREGATE BY:
Commodity

TYPE:
Outcome

DIRECTION OF CHANGE:
Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partner

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project level; those affected by USG project reach
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Ideally, implementing partner will collect in a census of all target beneficiaries. Sample survey-based approaches are also acceptable.
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: The value of incremental sales can be collected directly from a census or sample of farmer beneficiaries, from recorded sales data by farmer's associations, from farm records.
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported

Only count the increase in sales in the reporting year attributable to the FTF investment, i.e. where FTF assisted the individual farm directly. Examples of FTF investment could include: improved seeds, better input availability or farming techniques, marketing assistance or other activities that benefited farmers.

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Capacity
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 5: Increased resilience of vulnerable communities and households

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-25 Number of people with a savings account or insurance policy as a result of USG assistance (S)

DEFINITION:
This indicator counts the number of people who first acquired a savings account or insurance policy during the reporting year as a result of USG assistance. A savings account refers to any type of an account in a financial institution that serves as a store of an individual's financial wealth as well as savings in traditional institutional structures such as community savings groups. An insurance policy refers not only to agricultural insurance in the case of crop failure but also any other type of insurance, such as property, fishing access rights, health or life insurance that cushions an individual/household against financial shocks that could otherwise potentially make the individual or household food insecure.

Obtaining the value of a savings account can be difficult, and therefore will not be collected. The purpose of this indicator is to measure progress towards changed behavior of saving money as a buffer to the shock of income loss, and counting the number of savings or insurance accounts begins to measure this.

RATIONALE:
Food insecurity is often a result of financial shocks that may come from both agricultural production as well as loss of property or sickness or death of a household family member. Having a financial reserve in a savings account or an insurance policy is a means to buffer a household against these types of financial shocks that could leave the individual/household food insecure.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number	Type of account/policy: Savings, Insurance Sex of account owner or policy holder: Male, Female, Jointly-held
TYPE:	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:*
Outcome	Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:

Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project level; those affected by scope of USG project
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Implementing partner records or bank records
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Capacity
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1 Improved Agricultural Productivity / Sub IR 1.1 Enhanced human and institutional capacity development for increased sustainable agriculture sector productivity

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-27 Number of members of producer organizations and community based organizations receiving USG assistance (S)

DEFINITION:
A producer organization in this context is any grouping of people involved in agriculture including input suppliers, transporters, farmers, fishers, ranchers, processors, etc. that is organized around adding value to agricultural production. A community based organization (CBO) in this context is simply an organization involved in supporting any type of agricultural activity (including post-harvest transformation) and is based in a community and made up principally of individuals from the local community. Producer associations are often CBOs, but are reported as a distinct disaggregate USG assistance can include any help provided to either type of organization to expand coverage, services provided, information, etc. Some examples are organizational capacity building, training, other technical assistance, provision of supplies and materials, encouragement and motivation for improvements, etc. The indicator includes any person within the agricultural value chain who is a member of one of these organizations and thus directly received USG assistance.

This indicator counts the number of members within these types of organizations which receive assistance. It does not count the number of institutions, the amount of the assistance or the change in the value of agricultural commodities. Note that individuals counted under this indicator would also be part of households counted in the total number under indicator #4.5.2-13 (number of rural households benefiting), as applicable.

RATIONALE:
Helping the members of these institutions directly strengthens those organizations, which in turn will assist in improving the overall value of production in the agricultural value chain, improving productivity and contributing to a reduction in poverty, as most of the poor are in rural areas either as farmers, farm workers or workers in rural enterprises.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number	Type of organization: Producer organization, Non-producer-organization CBO Sex: Male, Female
TYPE:	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:*
Output	Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project level; those affected by USG project scope
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Project records
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1 Improved Agricultural Productivity / Sub IR 1.1 Enhanced human and institutional capacity development for increased sustainable agriculture sector productivity

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-28 Number of private enterprises, producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations and community-based organizations (CBOs) that applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (RiA) (WOG)

DEFINITION:
Total number of private enterprises (processors, input dealers, storage and transport companies) producer associations, cooperatives, water users associations, fishing associations, women's groups, trade and business associations and community-based organizations (CBOs), including those focused on natural resource management, that applied new technologies or management practices in areas including management (financial, planning, human resources), member services, procurement, technical innovations (processing, storage), quality control, marketing, etc. as a result of USG assistance in this reporting year. Only count the entity once per reporting year, even if multiple technologies or management practices are applied. Any groups applying a technology that was first applied in a previous year and continues to be applied in the reporting year should be included under "Continuing." However, if they added a new technology or practice during the reporting year to the ones they continued to apply from previous year(s), they would be counted as "New." No organization should be counted under both New and Continuing. .

Application of a new technology or management practice by the enterprise, association, cooperative or CBO is counted as one and not as applied by the number in their employees and/or membership. **For example, when a farmer association incorporates new corn storage innovations as a part of member services, the application is counted as one association and not multiplied by the number of farmer-members.**

Technologies to be counted here are agriculture-related technologies and innovations including those that address climate change adaptation and mitigation (e.g. carbon sequestration, clean energy, and energy efficiency as related to agriculture). Relevant technologies include but are not limited to:
• Mechanical and physical: New land preparation, harvesting, processing and product handling technologies, including biodegradable packaging
• Biological: New germ plasm (varieties, breeds, etc.) that could be higher-yielding or higher in nutritional content and/or more resilient to climate impacts; affordable food-based nutritional supplementation such as vitamin A-rich sweet potatoes or rice, or high-protein maize, or improved livestock breeds; soil management practices that increase biotic activity and soil organic matter levels; and livestock health services and products such as vaccines;
• Chemical: Fertilizers, insecticides, and pesticides sustainably and environmentally applied, and soil amendments that increase fertilizer-use efficiencies;
• Management and cultural practices: sustainable water management; practices; sustainable land management practices; sustainable fishing practices; Information technology, improved/sustainable agricultural production and marketing practices, increased use of climate information for planning disaster risk strategies in place, climate change mitigation and energy efficiency, and natural resource management practices that increase productivity and/or resiliency to climate change. IPM, ISFM, and PHH as related to agriculture should all be included as improved technologies or management practices.

RATIONALE:
Tracks private sector and civil society behavior change to increase agricultural sector productivity.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number	Type of organization (see indicator title for principal types) Duration: New, Continuing --New = entity applied a targeted new technology/management practice for the first time during the reporting year --Continuing = entity applied new technology(ies)/practice(s) in a previous year and continues to apply in the reporting year
TYPE:	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:*
Outcome	Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project-level; within the scope of the USG project
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Observation, project records, etc.
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 2: Expanding Markets & Trade / Sub IR 2.4: Improved access to business development and sound and affordable financial and risk management services

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-29 Value of Agricultural and Rural Loans (RiA) (WOG)

DEFINITION:
This indicator sum loans made (i.e**.** disbursed) during the reporting year to producers (farmers, fishers, etc.), input suppliers, transporters, processors, and loans to other MSMEs in rural areas that are in a targeted agricultural value chain, as a result of USG assistance. The indicator counts loans disbursed to the recipient, not loans merely made (e.g. in process, but not yet available to the recipient). The loans can be made by any size financial institution from micro-credit through national commercial bank, and includes any type of micro-finance institution, such as an NGO.

RATIONALE:
Making more financial loans shows that there is improved access to business development and financial services. This in turn will help expand markets and trade (and ought to also contribute to IR1's expanding agricultural productivity) which will help achieve the key objective of inclusive (the MSMEs) agriculture sector growth (with agriculture sector being defined broader than just crop production). In turn this contributes to both goals of reducing poverty and hunger.

UNIT: US Dollars Note: Convert local currency to US dollars at the average market foreign exchange rate for the reporting period	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* Type of loan recipient: producers, local traders/assemblers, wholesalers/processors, others. Sex of recipient: --Male --Female --Joint --n/a *For producers, the sex of the loan recipient should be used.* *For firms, if the enterprise is a single proprietorship, the sex of the proprietor should be used for classification. For larger enterprises, the majority ownership should be used. When this cannot be ascertained, the majority of the senior management should be used. If this cannot be ascertained, use n/a (not available)*
TYPE: Output	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partner

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project-level; within the scope of the USG project
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Bank/lending institution records or survey of targeted beneficiaries
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 2: Expanding Markets & Trade / Sub IR 2.4: Improved access to business development and sound and affordable financial and risk management services

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-30 Number of MSMEs, including farmers, receiving USG assistance to access loans (S)

DEFINITION:
Total number of micro (1-5) small (6-50) and medium (51-100) (parenthesis = number of employees) enterprises (MSMEs). Number of employees refers to full time-equivalent workers during the previous month. MSMEs include producers (farmers). Producers should be classified as micro, small or medium-enterprise based on the number of FTE workers hired (permanent and/or seasonal) during the previous 12 months. If a producer does not hire any permanent or seasonal labor, s/he should be considered a micro-enterprise. To be counted an MSME must have received USG assistance which resulted in a loan from any financial institution, formal or informal, including MFIs, commercial banks, or informal lenders, as well as from in-kind lenders of equipment (e.g. tractor, plow) or other agricultural inputs (e.g., fertilizer or seeds), or transport, with repayment in cash or in kind. USG assistance may include partial loan guarantee programs or any support facilitating the receipt of a loan.

The indicator does not measure the value of the loans, but the number of MSMEs that received USG assistance and accessed loans. Only count the MSME once per reporting year, even if multiple loans are accessed.

RATIONALE:
The lack of access to financial capital is frequently cited as a major impediment to the development of MSMEs, thus helping MSMEs access finances is likely to increase investment and the value of output (production in the case of farmers, value added for agricultural processing). This will directly contribute to the expansion of markets, increased agricultural productivity, and the reduction of poverty.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number	Size: Micro, Small, Medium Sex of owner/producer: Male, Female, Joint, n/a *If the enterprise is a single proprietorship, the sex of the proprietor should be used for classification. For larger enterprises, the majority ownership should be used. When this cannot be ascertained, the majority of the senior management should be used. If this cannot be ascertained, use n/a (not available)*
TYPE: Output	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partner

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project-level; within the scope of the USG project
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Project records, MSME financial records, etc.
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1: Improved Agricultural Productivity / Sub IR 1.1: Enhanced human and institutional capacity development for increased sustainable agriculture sector productivity

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-32 Number of stakeholders using climate information in their decision making as a result of USG assistance (S)

DEFINITION:
This indicator tracks decision-making among individual stakeholders with whom USG programs are specifically working to increase knowledge and use of climate information. Relevant climate data and information will vary according to the program context, but should be used by stakeholders (in the case of this indicator, defined as individual policy and decision makers) in the process of identification, assessment, and management of climate risks to improve resilience. Climate data may include monitored weather or climate projections (e.g., anticipated temperature, precipitation and sea level rise, changing frost-free dates, changing soil moisture and/or temperature, risk projections for extreme weather events, speed of soil erosion and water availability under future scenarios). Climate information might include the outputs of impact assessments, for example, the consequences of increased temperatures on crops, livestock, invasive species, pests and disease incidents, changes in stream flow due to precipitation shifts, or the number of people likely to be affected by future storm surges.

If more than one individual from an organization (e.g. Early Warning and Response Unit of Ministry of Agriculture) is directly using climate information for identification, assessment, and management of climate risks as a result of USG assistance, all such individuals from that organization should be counted. Practices and actions taken as a result of the climate information will aim to increase predictability/ productivity of agriculture under anticipated climate variability and change.

RATIONALE:
The use of climate information reflects that access to and quality of data (raw observations or facts) and information (interpreted) are sufficient, and reflects sufficient capacity of users to access and appropriately make use of data and information. Data and information as the basis for climate risk identification, assessment, and planning may be lacking, OR, rather, awareness and capacity of decision makers to access and make use of this data may be lacking. Where the use of information is lacking, outreach, training, collaboration on pilot activities, and other efforts may be necessary to build capacity for using available data and information in planning and action.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number	Sex: Male, Female
TYPE:	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:*
Outcome	Increase is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project-level; only those stakeholders involved in USG programs
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Via project records, survey or other applicable method
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2:Agricultural Sector Productivity
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: GCC and FTF – IR 1: Improved Agricultural Productivity / Sub IR 1.1: Enhanced human and institutional capacity development for increased sustainable agriculture sector productivity

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-34 Number of stakeholders implementing risk-reducing practices/actions to improve resilience to climate change as a result of USG assistance (S)

Definition:
There is strong scientific and evidence-based information that stakeholders (in the case of this indicator defined as "producers") involved in sectors such as agriculture, livestock, fishing, other areas of natural resources can mitigate the effects of climate change by using appropriate new and tested management practices or implement measures that reduce the risks of climate change impacts. For example, risk-reducing management practices in agriculture and livestock might include changing the exposure or sensitivity of crops (e.g., switching crops, using a greenhouse, or changing the cropping calendar), soil management practices that reduce rainwater run-off and increase infiltration, changing grazing practices, or adjusting the management of other aspects of the system. Risk reducing measures might include applying new technologies like improved seeds or irrigation methods, diversifying into different income-generating activities or into crops that are less susceptible to drought and greater climatic variability. Any adjustment to the management of resources or implementation of an adaptation action that responds to climate-related stresses and increases resilience can be considered.

Practices and actions will aim to increase predictability and/or productivity of agriculture under anticipated climate variability and change.

RATIONALE:
While many management practices and technologies exist and can be diffused, others may not be well suited to perform under emerging climate stresses. Improved management and new technologies are available and others are being developed to perform better under climate stresses. Resource management experiences from other parts of the world may be useful as climate conditions shift geographically.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number of stakeholders	Type of Risk reducing practice: -Agriculture – practices and actions will aim to increase predictability and/or productivity of agriculture under anticipated climate variability and change. -Water – practices and actions will aim to improve water quality, supply, and efficient use under anticipated climate variability and change. -Health – practices and actions will aim to prevent or control disease incidence and outcomes under anticipated climate variability and change outcomes. -Disaster Risk Management – practices and actions will aim to reduce the negative impacts of extreme events associated with climate variability and change. -Urban – practices and actions will aim to improve the resilience of urban areas, populations, and infrastructure under anticipated climate variability and change. Sex: Male, Female
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Field surveys by local project partners, including extension agents and farmer/producer organizations (and other types of organizations)

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project-level; only those stakeholders involved in USG programs
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Via Implementing Partner records, survey or other applicable method
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 2: Expanding Markets and Trade

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-35 Percent change in value of intra-regional trade in targeted agricultural commodities (RiA)

DEFINITION:
This indicator tracks the direction and magnitude of annual change in the value of intra-regional trade in targeted agricultural commodities within a sub-region or regional economic community. The intent of this indicator is to monitor regional trade in selected agricultural commodities, even outside of direct USG attribution, and should be reported by the regional missions who historically monitor this information. Note that regional exports counted in the indicator #4.5.2-36 "Value of exports of targeted agricultural commodities as a result of USG assistance") would be included in those counted here, while non-regional exports counted in #4.5.2-36 would not be counted here.

"Region" should be defined by the regional mission, who can best determine the applicable countries involved in a trade region. **Trade outside of this defined region should NOT be included in this indicator.**

In summary, indicator #4.5.2-35 collects trade ONLY within a region, but more than USG attributable, while #4.5.2-36 collects all trade within and outside of a region, but ONLY that which is USG-attributable.

RATIONALE:
Increased agricultural trade is one of the end results of efficient markets. Note that this indicator is meant for reporting by regional missions, not bilateral missions.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Percent *Volume (in metric tons) sold and Value (in USD) will be collected* *Note: Convert local currency to US dollars at the average market foreign exchange rate for the reporting period* *FTF system note: Both volume of regional trade (in metric tons) and value (in USD) will be collected each year and the percent change will be calculated automatically.*	Commodity Exporting country
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
To be tracked and reported to USAID by regional partner or team with appropriate analytical capacity as selected by the regional mission.

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Targeted commodities at the regional level (non-regional trade not included here)
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Regional missions, through appropriate partners, as necessary
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Where available, informal trade data should be taken into account. Regional Missions should work with appropriate partners to develop best measurement. FEWSNET could be one source of trade on specific commodities.
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2 AGRICULTURAL SECTOR PRODUCTIVITY
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 2: Expanding Markets and Trade

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-36 Value of exports of targeted agricultural commodities as a result of USG assistance (S)

DEFINITION:
This indicator will measure the value of regional and non-regional exports in USD attributable to USG assistance. Exports should be counted against the baseline of existing export levels from the previous year (existing exports before USG intervention for the first year, or additional exports for subsequent years). Exports can include those within and outside of neighboring regions, so as to avoid loss of counter-seasonal exports, which often leave the proximate region. The commodities to be counted are those that are targeted in the work plans and/or contracts of the implementing partners.

Note that these within-region exports could also be counted in indicator #4.5.2-35, which is intended to measure overall regional trade in certain commodities, even beyond USG attribution.

In summary, indicator #4.5.2-35 collects trade ONLY within a region, but more than USG attributable, while #4.5.2-36 collects all trade within and outside of a region, but ONLY that which is USG-attributable.

RATIONALE:
Increased agricultural trade is one of the end results of efficient markets.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
US dollar *Volume (in metric tons) sold and Value (in USD) will be collected* *Note: Convert local currency to US dollars at the average market foreign exchange rate for the reporting period*	Commodity Destination: -Regional (value of exports sent within the region), -Outside of Region (value of exports going outside of region) .
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project level; only those exports attributable to the USG project
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Producer records, available trade data, etc.
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 2: Expanding Markets & Trade / Sub IR 2.4: Improved access to business development and sound and affordable financial and risk management services

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-37 Number of MSMEs, including farmers, receiving business development services from USG assisted sources (S)

DEFINITION:
Total number of micro (1-5) small (6-50) and medium (51-100) enterprises (parenthesis = number of employees) receiving services from FTF-supported enterprise development providers. Number of employees refers to full time-equivalent (FTE) workers during the previous month. MSMEs include producers (farmers). Producers should be classified as micro, small or medium-enterprise based on the number of FTE workers hired (permanent and/or seasonal) during the previous 12 months.). If a producer does not hire any permanent or seasonal labor, s/he should be considered a micro-enterprise. Services may include, among other things, business planning, procurement, technical support in production techniques, quality control and marketing, micro-enterprise loans, etc. . Clients may be involved in agricultural production, agro-processing, community forestry, fisheries, input suppliers, or other small businesses receiving USG assistance. Additional examples of enterprise-focused services include: **Market Access:** These services identify/establish new markets for small enterprise (SE) products; facilitate the creation of links between all the actors in a given market and enable buyers to expand their outreach to, and purchases from, SEs; enable SEs to develop new products and produce them to buyer specifications. **Input supply:** These services help SEs improve their access to raw materials and production inputs; facilitate the creation of links between SEs and suppliers and enable the suppliers to both expand their outreach to SEs and develop their capacity to offer better, less expensive inputs. **Technology and Product Development:** These services research and identify new technologies for SEs and look at the capacity of local resource people to produce, market, and service those technologies on a sustainable basis; develop new and improved SE products that respond to market demand. **Training and Technical Assistance:** These services develop the capacity of enterprises to better plan and manage their operations and improve their technical expertise; develop sustainable training and technical assistance products that SEs are willing to pay for and they foster links between service providers and enterprises. **Finance:** These services help SEs identify and access funds through formal and alternative channels that include supplier or buyer credits, factoring companies, equity financing, venture capital, credit unions, banks, and the like; assist buyers in establishing links with commercial banks (letters of credit, etc.) to help them finance SE production directly. **Infrastructure:** These services establish sustainable infrastructure (refrigeration, storage, processing facilities, transport systems, loading equipment, communication centers, and improved roads and market places) that enables SEs to increase sales and income. **Policy/Advocacy:** These services carry out subsector analyses and research to identify policy constraints and opportunities for SEs; facilitate the organization of coalitions, trade organizations, or associations of business people, donors, government officials, academics, etc. to effect policies that promote the interests of SEs.

Only count the MSME once per reporting year, even if multiple services are received.

RATIONALE:
This indicator measures directly the sub-IR of access to business development services which contributes to the IR of expanding markets and trade. The IR impacts on the Key Objective of increasing agricultural productivity which will help achieve the goal of reducing poverty and hunger.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number	Size: Micro, Small, Medium, as defined above MSME Type: Agricultural producer, Input supplier, Trader, Output processors, Non-agriculture, Other *Sex* of owner/producer: Male, Female, Joint, n/a. *Most enterprises are likely to be small (or very small), probably single proprietorships, in which case the sex of the proprietor should be used for classification. For larger enterprises, the majority ownership should be used. When this cannot be ascertained, the majority of the senior management should be used. If this cannot be ascertained, n/a (not available) should be used*
TYPE:	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:*
Output	Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partner

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
In the case that an individual MSME participates in multiple trainings or technical assistance in one year, it should be counted as one MSME enterprise. This indicator should count MSMEs receiving trainings or development services within the reporting year, not an accumulation of all trainings that MSME received in the life of USG project.

- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project-level; only those MSMEs receiving trainings/service within the scope of the USG project in the reporting year.
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Training participant records
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 3: Increased sector investment in agriculture and nutrition related activities

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-38 Value of new private sector investment in the agriculture sector or food chain leveraged by FTF implementation (RiA)

DEFINITION:
Investment is defined as any use of private sector resources intended to increase future production output or income, to improve the sustainable use of agriculture-related natural resources (soil, water, etc.), to improve water or land management, etc. The "food chain" includes both upstream and downstream investments. Upstream investments include any type of agricultural capital used in the agricultural production process such as animals for traction, storage bins, and machinery. Downstream investments could include capital investments in equipment, etc. to do post-harvest transformation/processing of agricultural products as well as the transport of agricultural products to markets. "Private sector" includes any privately-led agricultural activity managed by a for-profit formal company. A CBO or NGO resources may be included if they engage in for-profit agricultural activity. "Leveraged by FTF implementation" indicates that the new investment was directly encouraged or facilitated by activities funded by the FTF initiative. Investments reported should not include funds received by the investor from USG as part of any grant or other award. New investment means investment made during the reporting year.

RATIONALE:
Increased investment is the predominate source of economic growth in the agricultural and other economic sectors. Private sector investment is critical because it indicates that the investment is perceived by private agents to provide a positive financial return and therefore is likely to lead to sustainable increases in agricultural production. Agricultural growth is critical to achieving the FTF goal to "Sustainably Reduce Global Poverty and Hunger."

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
US Dollars	None
TYPE:	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:*
Outcome	Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project-level; new investment (within reporting year) leveraged within scope of USG project
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Private sector financial records, program data
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1: Improved Agricultural Productivity / Sub IR 1.2: Enhanced Technology Development, Dissemination, Management and Innovation

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-39 Number of technologies or management practices in one of the following phases of development:

- **…*in Phase I*: under research as a result of USG assistance**
- **…*in Phase II*: under field testing as a result of USG assistance**
- **…*in Phase III*: made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance (S)**

DEFINITION:
Technologies to be counted here are agriculture-related technologies and innovations including those that address climate change adaptation and mitigation (including carbon sequestration, clean energy, and energy efficiency as related to agriculture), and may relate to any of the products at any point on the supply chain.

Relevant technologies include:

• Mechanical and physical: New land preparation, harvesting, processing and product handling technologies, including packaging, sustainable water management practices; sustainable land management practices; sustainable fishing practices;
• Biological: New germ plasm (varieties, breeds, etc.) that could be higher-yielding or higher in nutritional content and/or more resilient to climate impacts; biofortified crops such as vitamin A-rich sweet potatoes or rice, or high-protein maize, or improved livestock breeds; soil management practices that increase biotic activity and soil organic matter levels; and livestock health services and products such as vaccines;
• Chemical: Fertilizers, insecticides, and pesticides sustainably and environmentally applied, and soil amendments that increase fertilizer-use efficiencies;
• Management and cultural practices: Information technology, improved/sustainable agricultural production and marketing practices, increased use of climate information for planning risk management strategies, climate change mitigation and energy efficiency, and natural resource management practices that increase productivity and/or resiliency to climate change. IPM, ISFM, and PHH as related to agriculture should all be included as improved technologies or management practices

Significant improvements to existing technologies should also be counted; an improvement would be significant if, among other reasons, it served a new purpose or allowed a new class of users to employ it. Examples include a scaled-down milk container that allows individuals to carry it easily, a new blend of fertilizer for a particular soil, tools modified to suit a particular management practice, and improved fishing gear.

- *…in Phase I*: under research as a result of USG assistance

  New technologies or management practices under research counted should be only those under research in the current reporting year. Any new technology or management practice under research in a previous year but not under research in the reporting year should not be included. Technologies under research are as follows:

  a. For biotech crop research: When technologies are under research, the process is contained in a laboratory or greenhouse; once the possibility of success is judged high enough, a permit is required to move to field testing. The change of location from a contained laboratory or greenhouse to a confined field and the receipt of a permit indicate that the research has completed the "under research" stage.
  b. For non-biotech crop research: When technologies are under research, plant breeders work on developing new lines on research plots under controlled conditions. All research should have a target, often expressed in terms of traits to be combined into a specific cultivar or breed. When the research achieves "proof of concept" (by accumulating technical information and test results that indicate that the target is achievable), the "under research" phase is completed. Note that for crops, much or all of this phase might be conducted outdoors and in soil; these attributes do not make this work "field testing."
  c. For non-crop research: "under research" signifies similarly research conducted under ideal conditions to develop or support the development of the product or process.

- *…in Phase II*: under field testing as a result of USG assistance

  "Under field testing" means that research has moved from focused development to broader testing and this testing is underway under conditions intended to duplicate those encountered by potential users of the new technology. This might be in the actual facilities (fields) of potential users, or it might be in a facility set up to duplicate those conditions. More specifically:

  a. For biotech crop research: Once a permit has been obtained and the research moves to a confined field, the research is said to be "under field testing."
  b. For non-biotech crop or fisheries research: During this phase the development of the product or technology continues under end-user conditions in multi-location trails, which might be conducted at a research station or on farmers'/producer's fields/waters or both. Note that for crops, all of this phase would be conducted outdoors and in soil, but this is not what makes this work "field testing."
  c. For non-crop research: "under field testing" signifies similarly research conducted under user conditions to further test the

product, process, or practice. In the case of research to improve equipment, the endpoint of field testing could be sales of equipment (when the tester is a commercial entity). In other cases it could be distribution of designs (when the tester is a noncommercial entity) and also distribution of publications or other information (on the force of the good results of field testing).

- …*in Phase III*: made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance.
  Note that completing a research activity does not in itself constitute having made a technology available. In the case of crop research that developed a new variety, e.g., the variety must have passed through any required approval process, and seed of the new variety should be available for multiplication. The technology should have proven benefits and be as ready for use as it can be as it emerges from the research and testing process. In some cases more than one operating unit may count the same technology. This would occur if the technology were developed, for instance, in collaboration with a U.S. university and passed through regional collaboration to other countries. Technologies made available for transfer should be only those made available in the current reporting year. Any technology made available in a previous year should not be included.

RATIONALE:
This indicator tracks the three stages in research and technology investments and progress toward dissemination.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number	Phase of development: -Under research as a result of USG assistance; -Under field testing as a result of USG assistance; -Made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance
TYPE:	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:*
Output	Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project-level; only those technologies made available under field research as a result of the USG project
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Project records or survey
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity **INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1: Improved Agricultural Productivity /Sub IR 1.2: Enhanced Technology Development, Dissemination, Management and Innovation**	
INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2–40 Number of hectares of agricultural land (fields, rangeland, agro-forests) showing improved biophysical conditions as a result of USG assistance (RiA) [INDICATOR ON HOLD]	
DEFINITION: TBD	
RATIONALE: TBD	
UNIT: TBD	*DISAGGREGATE BY:* TBD
TYPE: Outcome	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:* TBD
DATA SOURCE: TBD	
MEASUREMENT NOTES: ➢ TBD	

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1: Improve agricultural productivity / Sub IR 1.2: Enhanced Technology Development, Dissemination, Management and Innovation

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-41 Number of water resources sustainability assessments undertaken (S)

DEFINITION:

Water Resources Sustainability Assessments are evaluations of the water resources availability and use in a country. Attention is specifically devoted to environmental water requirements and sustainability of water use in the face of climate variability and change at the basin level

RATIONALE:

Water is frequently diverted for different uses without sufficient consideration for the larger impacts of that use. As a result, basin level sustainability is often compromised and conflicts arise between uses and users in different parts of basins. To help mitigate this outcome, water resources sustainability assessments can foster a broader approach to integrated water resources management that facilitates more optimal and harmonious outcomes.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number	Location: Transboundary, National Scale: Basin-level, Sub-basin level, Field level
TYPE:	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:*
Output	Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing partners

MEASUREMENT NOTES:

- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project-level
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Via Implementing partner records
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 3: Increased investment in agriculture and nutrition related activities/Sub IR 3.2: Increased private sector investment

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-43 Number of firms (excluding farms) or Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) engaged in agricultural and food security-related manufacturing and services now operating more profitably (at or above cost) because of USG assistance (RiA)

DEFINITION:
To measure sustainable private sector investment, we will look at profitability of applicable firms and financial self-sufficiency of civil society organizations (CSOs) as a marker of viability. A CSO is financially self-sufficiency when the COS's annual income is more than annual operating expenses and annual amortization and depreciation of permanent assets. Although profitability or self-sufficiency measured during the period the USG is providing assistance does not demonstrate all aspects of a whether a business or a CSO will remain sustainably successful after withdrawal of USG assistance, it is certainly an important measure of its capacity to function effectively. Only the profitability of firms and self-sufficiency of CSOs who are receiving USG capacity-building assistance that is intended to increase profitability or viability should be tracked.

A firm should be counted if it operated more profitably in the reporting year than it did the previous reporting year. A CSO should be counted if it was financially self-sufficient in the reporting year and it had **not** been financially self-sufficient in the previous reporting year.

RATIONALE:
A main goal of local capacity building is to leave behind viable businesses and service providers to contribute to the economic growth of the agriculture and food-security sector. Profitability of firms and self-sufficiency of civil society organizations is one way to demonstrate that viability and sustainability of the businesses/firms/CSOs in which we invest.

UNIT:	*DISAGGREGATE BY:*
Number	Type of entity: Firm, CSO

TYPE:	*DIRECTION OF CHANGE:*
Outcome	Higher is better

DATA SOURCE:
Implementing Partner records

MEASUREMENT NOTES:
FTF System Note: Please enter the name of the firms or CSO, followed by its stage in order to best track movement to increased profitability.

- LEVEL of COLLECTION: Targeted beneficiaries
- WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners working directly with firms and NGOs
- HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Accounting records of the targeted firms and NGOs
- FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported